This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

ANDOVER-HARVARD LIBRARY
AH 5LK4 Y

Harvard Depository
Brittle Book

HARVARD
DIVINITY
SCHOOL
Andover-Harvard
Theological Library

A

TREATISE

ON THE

GENIUS AND OBJECT

OF

THE PATRIARCHAL, THE LEVITICAL,

AND

THE CHRISTIAN,

DISPENSATIONS.

BY GEORGE STANLEY FABER, B.D.

RECTOR OF LONG-NEWTON.

Ταυτην μονην εὑρισκον φιλοσοφιαν ασφαλη τε και συμφορον.

JUSTIN MARTYR.

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. I.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR C. & J. RIVINGTON,

ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD;

AND WATERLOO-PLACE, PALL-MALL.

1823.

339.8

LONDON:
PRINTED BY R. GILBERT,
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.

Recd. Nov. 15, 1872.

TO THE

MOST REVEREND

WILLIAM MAGEE, D.D.

ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN;

A PRELATE,

WHOSE HAPPILY-DIRECTED LEARNING AND TALENTS CONFER

AS MUCH HONOUR UPON HIS HIGH STATION IN THE

CHURCH AS HE HIMSELF PERSONALLY

DERIVES FROM IT,

THIS WORK

IS

RESPECTFULLY INSCRIBED AND DEDICATED,

BY

THE AUTHOR.

PREFACE.

THEOLOGY is a mine, which cannot be very easily exhausted. Directly or indirectly, it comprehends so much within its circle, that almost every other line of study may well be deemed subservient to it. Hence, even if two persons agree in their sentiments on any particular topic, they will always differ very greatly in their mode of treating and illustrating it: but, if they disagree in their very principles, their respective productions will then indeed be most widely dissimilar.

In regard both to the Levitical Dispensation and to that form of serving God which preceded it, my own views are certainly very unlike those of Bishop Warburton, though no person is more disposed than myself to concede all due honour to that

truly great and original mind. The field of discussion however lies open to every one: and the cause of truth will always be advanced by patient investigation. I have endeavoured to establish a system relative to the genius and object of God's ancient communications to man, which I conceive to be more scriptural than that of the author of *the divine legation of Moses.* In pursuing this design, it was impossible for me not to notice the theory of Bishop Warburton: but, whenever my subject has brought me in collision with that eminent prelate, I trust that I have always preserved the respect which is due to such a man. Much has often been said of his lordship's acrimony: but they, who undertake to censure him, would do well to consider the provocation which he received. I mean not to say, that any provocation can absolutely justify a man in departing from the spirit of Christian courtesy: but it surely may do much in the way of extenuation. Most lamentable it is, that persons cannot differ

upon a litigated theological topic without thinking it necessary to revile and calumniate and tear each other in pieces: but still it ought not to be forgotten, that by far the greatest part of the Bishop's lofty roughness owed its origin to the vulgar and disgusting abuse of his opponents. When a man, conscious of his own integrity and of his sincere desire to promote the cause of religion, has not, on that account, been the more able to escape from the brutal fangs of those who undertook to examine his noble work; we may grieve, but we cannot wonder, that such a man, feeling as he must have felt the mightiness of his intellectual powers, should have dealt around him his giant blows with more of strenuousness than of suavity.

Long-Newton Rectory,
April 18, 1819.

CONTENTS

OF

VOLUME I.

BOOK I.

RESPECTING THE OBJECT OF THE PATRIARCHAL DISPENSATION.

p. 1.

CHAPTER I.

On the peculiar genius of the three Dispensations. p. 3.

I. The genius of Patriarchism was *universality*. p. 4.

1. The first period of the Patriarchal Church. p. 6.

(1.) The apostasy of Cain consisted in a rejection of the doctrine of the atonement. p. 6.

(2.) The apostasy of his descendants matured into absolute infidelity, and overspread the face of the whole earth. p. 9.

2. The second period of the Patriarchal Church. The apostasy from it consisted of astronomical Hero-worship: but the doctrine of the atonement was strenuously retained. p. 13.

II. The genius of the Levitical Dispensation was *particularity*. p. 15.

1. The Levitical Church was the medium, through which divine knowledge was to be preserved and gradually communicated to an apostatising world. p. 15.
2. Its characteristic particularity was expressly foretold. p. 17.
3. This particularity began to be withdrawn, when the time for the advent of the promised Saviour approached. p. 19.

III. The genius of Christianity, like that of Patriarchism, is *universality*. p. 20.

CHAPTER II.

An examination of the theory of Bishop Warburton, relative to the state of man from his first creation to the promulgation of the Law. p. 24.

The theory of Bishop Warburton, relative to the state of man from his first creation to the promulgation of the Law, does in effect destroy the very existence of any such Dispensation as we are wont to call *Patriarchal*. p. 24.

I. He contends, that Adam and Eve were not placed in Paradise immediately on their creation; but that, having been created mortal, they were kept some time under the tutelage of natural religion, ere they were introduced into the garden and there gifted with immortality upon their first becoming the subjects of revealed religion. p. 30.

1. The argument, by which he would prove that our first parents were created mortal. p. 30.

(1.) The statement, upon which this argument is built, is itself inaccurate. p. 31.

(2.) The bishop's assertion, that man was originally created mortal and that immortality was

afterward bestowed upon him in Paradise, does not accord with the scriptural account of death as being the penalty of sin. p. 33.

(3.) He has omitted to give an accurate definition of the term *mortality*. p. 37.

(4.) His attempt to prove extrinsically, that by the fall the soul of Adam became mortal as he supposes it to have been originally created, is not satisfactory. p. 40.

(5.) He himself admits, that this supposed loss of immortality on the part of the soul of man is not declared explicitly by Moses. p. 41.

(6.) He is inconsistent even with his own theory: for, after all, he admits, that in truth the human soul did *not* become mortal in consequence of the fall. p. 43.

2. The arguments, by which he would prove, that our first parents, previous to their introduction into Paradise, were kept under the sole tutelage of natural religion. p. 50.

(1.) His first argument stated and discussed. p. 51.

(2.) His second argument stated and discussed. p. 54.

3. The argument, by which he would prove the existence of an anteparadisiacal state on the part of our first parents, shewn to be inconclusive by the fact that Eve was created IN Paradise: whence she plainly could not have existed in an anteparadisiacal state. p. 60.

4. Respecting the true chronological arrangement of the planting of the sacred garden of Eden. The bishop supposes, that the garden was planted on the third day of the creation; whereas it really was planted on the sixth day. His opinion quadrates; p. 66.

(1.) Neither with the obvious purport of the history of the third day's work. p. 66.

(2.) Nor with the natural plan of the entire narrative. p. 68.

II. He contends, that man was subject only to natural religion from the fall to the promulgation of the Law. p. 73.

1. This opinion is directly contradicted by the testimony of Scripture. p. 76.

(1.) A discussion of the earliest of what Bishop Warburton maintains to be only occasional communications from heaven. p. 82.

(2.) The scriptural history of man through the period, during which the bishop would turn him over to the sole guidance of natural religion. p. 91.

(3.) The bishop is unwilling to allow the name of *a system* to what he deems only an occasional communication. An examination of the validity of this sentiment. p. 96.

2. It is opposed by ancient pagan tradition. p. 99.

III. He contends, that man lived under an equal or extraordinary Providence from the fall down to the time when polytheism universally prevailed, and that this supplied his alleged ignorance of a future state. p. 100.

1. His evidence for this opinion is defective in *quantity*. p. 105.

2. It is unsatisfactory in its *nature*. p. 106.

3. The opinion is sufficiently overturned by the single case of Cain and Abel. p. 107.

CHAPTER III.

Respecting the length of the six demiurgic days, in the course of which God is said to have fashioned the material world out of Chaos. p. 111.

That the six demiurgic days were six periods, each of vast though uncertain length, may be proved by four several arguments. p. 111.

I. By analogy of language. p. 112.

II. By the necessity of the Mosaical narrative. p. 117.

III. By the tenor of ancient tradition. p. 119.

1. The doctrine of the Hindoos. p. 119.

2. The doctrine of the ancient Persians and Etruscans. p. 119.

IV. By the discoveries of modern physiologists. p. 120.

1. The deluge is insufficient to account for the fossil phenomena, which occur in the strata of the earth. p. 121.

(1.) Whole *genera* of animals now exist only in a fossil state: but we are assured, that pairs of all the *genera* of antediluvian land-animals were preserved in the ark: therefore those *genera* could not have become extinct by means of the flood. p. 122.

(2.) The strata, which contain the fossils in question have been broken and dislocated *by* the flood: therefore the strata themselves, and consequently the fossils which they contain, must have existed *before* the flood. p. 123.

(3.) No proper fossil portion of the human subject has ever yet been discovered; a matter wholly unaccountable, if the other fossils were the consequence of the deluge. p. 124.

2. Every difficulty will be removed, if we admit the six demiurgic days to be six very long periods. p. 125.

(1.) The work of the first day. p. 126.

(2.) The work of the second day. p. 128.

(3.) The work of the third day. p. 130.

(4.) The work of the fourth day. p. 132.

(5.) The work of the fifth day. p. 134.

(6.) The work of the sixth day. p. 141.

3. We are now dwelling on the organic remains or fossilated ruins of the third and fifth and sixth demiurgic periods. p. 143.

4. With the theory thus exhibited, the actual formation of the globe perfectly agrees. p. 143.

(1.) The waters once covered, during a long space of time, the matter out of which the primitive mountains have been formed: and, during that long space of time, they did not support any living bodies. p. 143.

(2.) The earth was brought into its present state, not instantaneously, but by a long series of consecutive operations. p. 145.

(3.) There was no more than a single formation of each class of vegetables and animals: so that, although many *genera* may have become extinct anterior to the formation of man, and although many *species* of *genera* now existing may have perished in the waters of the deluge, still no new formation of any new *species* or *genera* has subsequently occurred. p. 145.

(4.) The actual succession of extraneous fossils, in the several strata of the earth, exactly agrees with the order of formation in the work of the six days, as set forth by Moses: insomuch that the earliest organized bodies are found in the lowest strata; and the later organized bodies severally, in the higher strata. p. 149.

5. An extension of time far beyond six natural days being rendered absolutely necessary by existing phenomena, it is to be procured by lengthening the six days into six vast periods, rather than by placing any acts of *formation*, as contradistinguished to *creation*, anterior to the first of the six days. p. 156.

(1.) Because the order of fossil stratification is found exactly to agree with the order observed in the work of the six days; a coincidence, which clearly evinces their mutual connection. p. 157.

(2.) Because the placing any act of *formation* anterior to the first demiurgic day is irreconcileable with the scriptural account; which unequivocally represents the work of *formation* as *commencing* on the first day, and therefore shuts out any *prior* act of *formation*. p. 157.

6. The utility of extending the six days into six long periods, on the ground that such an arrangement furnishes an effectual answer to the infidel objection which has been drawn from the lavas of mount Etna with their alternating strata of mould. p. 159.

7. There is some reason to believe, that the ancient physiologists of Babylon were not wholly ignorant of the fact, that many *genera* and *species* of once existing animals are now extinct. p. 162.

CHAPTER IV.

The object of the Patriarchal Dispensation was to inculcate the doctrine of Redemption. p. 167.

An inquiry into the special object of the Patriarchal Dispensation. This we must learn from the history of the fall. p. 167.

I. The inquiry conducted negatively. p. 168.

1. The object of the Patriarchal Dispensation was not to convey the knowledge of the Divine Unity. p. 168.

2. Its object was not to inculcate authoritatively the duties of morality. p. 169.
3. Its object was not to teach the divine attributes of wisdom and power and justice. p. 169.
4. Its object was not to communicate any knowledge, which man had already possessed during his abode in Paradise. p. 170.

II. The inquiry conducted positively. p. 170.
1. The object of the Patriarchal Dispensation must have been to inculcate the doctrine of Redemption. p. 170.
2. Accordingly, it commences with the promise of a Redeemer. p. 171.

CHAPTER V.

Respecting the knowledge of the doctrine of Redemption possessed by mankind during the patriarchal ages, so far as the matter can be ascertained from Scripture. p. 173.

Here however an inquiry arises, whether the import of the first promise was *at all* understood by the early race of mortals; and, if at all, *to what extent.* p. 173.

I. A discussion of the question, whether the import of the first promise was *at all* understood by the early race of mortals. p. 174.
1. The obvious nature and intention of the prophecy respecting the Seed of the woman requires us to suppose, that man understood the drift of the first promise, so far as was necessary for every saving purpose. p. 174.
2. This is admitted by Bishop Warburton: and such an admission involves a knowledge both of redemption and of a future state. p. 177.

II. A discussion of the question, *to what extent* the import of the first promise was understood by the early race of mortals. p. 182.

1. The primary question of our first parents after the fall would respect the nature of the serpent. p. 183.

2. Their next inquiry would regard the nature and appellation of the promised Seed of the woman. p. 185.

(1.) After the fall, Jehovah the Messenger visibly manifested himself in a palpable form to our first parents. p. 186.

(2.) This form was the human. p. 188.

(3.) The institution of sacrifice by the Divine Word thus manifested. p. 195.

(4.) The language of Eve gives us reason to believe, that she knew the promised Seed to be the same as the Divine Word manifested in a human form. p. 200.

3. The explanatory revelation of the first promise was made at the institution of sacrifice. p. 203.

(1.) The universally prevalent notion of vicarious piacularity must, in the very nature of things, have been handed down from Adam. p. 203.

(2.) The mode, in which the explanatory revelation was made, was by significant actions. p. 208.

(3.) The doctrine of the atonement, in its grand peculiar features, must have been made known to our first parents. p. 210.

III. A discussion of Bishop Warburton's theory of the origination of sacrifice. p. 211.

1. The necessity of this theory to his lordship's favourite opinion. p. 211.

2. The opinion, that sacrifice was of mere human institution, is unsatisfactory, and rests upon no solid grounds. p. 214.

(1.) The first difficulty which attends it. p. 219.
(2.) The second difficulty. p. 220.

IV. General conclusion, that the doctrine of an atonement through the piacular death of the woman's promised Seed was made known to Adam and Eve with sufficient clearness to answer every salutary purpose. p. 221.

CHAPTER VI.

Respecting the knowledge of the doctrine of Redemption possessed by mankind during the patriarchal ages, so far as the matter can be ascertained from the theology of the Gentiles. p. 224.

I. An account of the different principles, which have been adopted, for the purpose of interpreting gentile theology. p. 224.
1. The first theory. p. 225.
2. The second theory. p. 225.
3. The third theory. p. 226.

II. It is absurd to adopt any theory on mere abstract speculation: for naked historical evidence is the only satisfactory basis, on which it can rest. p. 226.
1. A trial of the first theory by this test. p. 228.
2. A trial of the second theory by the same test. p. 236.
3. A trial of the third theory by the same test. p. 239.
(1.) Evidence, that the Hero-gods of the Gentiles were deified men. p. 241.
(2.) A discussion of the question, what particular men those Hero-gods were. p. 246.

III. A discussion of the often litigated point, whether Hero-

worship or Sabianism was the more ancient form of idolatry. p. 255.

1. A statement of the argument in favour of the priority of Hero-worship. p. 256.

2. An examination of the evidence afforded by Sanchoniatho. p. 262.

(1.) If we admit the alleged evidence to be valid, it is still irrelevant to the point under litigation. p. 263.

(2.) That part of the evidence, which alone really bears upon the point, demonstrates the priority of Hero-worship. p. 264.

3. Respecting Sanchoniatho's attestation to the antediluvian origin of Sabianism. p. 270.

(1.) We are not positively taught in Scripture, that the antediluvians were Sabians. p. 271.

(2.) The nature and consequences of the antediluvian apostasy. p. 272.

4. An examination of Bishop Warburton's theory. p. 275.

(1.) There is a total want of proof, that idolatry sprang up in consequence of the early descendants of Noah soon loosing the revealed knowledge of their Creator. p. 278.

(2.) His account of the rise of Hero-worship is unsatisfactory. p. 287.

(3.) His account of the rise of Sabianism is equally unsatisfactory. p. 293.

IV. An inquiry into the mode, in which gentile theology originated. p. 296.

1. Early speculations respecting the import of the phrase *Seed of the woman*. p. 298.

(1.) Consequences which flowed from the opinion of those, who held that the promised Deliverer was to be born in the ordinary course of generation. p. 300.

(2.) Consequences which flowed from the opinion of

those, who held that he was to be miraculously born from a virgin. p. 306.

2. The sentiments of the Gentiles relative to the sacrificial atonement to be made by the serpenticidal and virgin-born God. p. 312.

(1.) The mystical sacrifice of the Phenicians. p. 313.

(2.) The mystical sacrifice of the Hindoos. p. 314.

(3.) The mystical sacrifice of the Chinese. p. 319.

(4.) The mystical sacrifice of the Greeks. p. 319.

(5.) The mystical sacrifice of the Mexicans. p. 320.

(6.) The *rationale* or principle of human sacrifices. p. 321.

3. The mode, in which the prevalence of such opinions must be accounted for. p. 321.

V. An exemplification of the preceding theory in the character of Prometheus-Vinctus. p. 325.

1. The character of Prometheus as borrowed from Adam and Noah. p. 326.

2. The character of Prometheus as borrowed from the predicted Seed of the woman. p. 329.

3. Analysis of the drama of Prometheus-Vinctus. p. 330.

4. The key to this extraordinary drama is the theory, which has been laid down relative to the origination of gentile theology. p. 338.

CHAPTER VII.

Respecting the nature of the antediluvian apostasy. p. 344.

It may be doubted, whether the apostate angels, mentioned by St. Jude and St. Peter, mean Satan and his confederates. p. 346.

I. The context of the passage in St. Jude affords a key to the right understanding both of itself and the parallel passage in St. Peter. p. 346.

1. The angels, mentioned by St. Jude, cannot be unembodied spirits. p. 347.

(1.) The original Greek word simply denotes *messengers* of any description. p. 347.

(2.) But, what *sort* of messengers is intended, must be determined by the context: and that context shews, that they cannot be unembodied spirits. p. 348.

2. The sense of the passage in St. Jude having been thus negatively ascertained, we shall thence be enabled also negatively to ascertain the sense of the parallel passage in St. Peter. p. 353.

(1.) The passage with its context, as it occurs in St. Jude. p. 353.

(2.) The parallel passage with its context, as it occurs in St. Peter. p. 356.

3. The character of certain impious heretics, both of their own and of future times, is described and foretold by those apostles: and such heretics are compared to the wicked antediluvians, to the profligate Sodomites, to the unbelieving Israelites, and lastly to the apostate angels or messengers. p. 358.

4. Our search therefore for these heretics must be twofold. p. 359.

(1.) Those of them, who were contemporary with the apostles, were the paganizing heretics of the Gnostic school. p. 360.

(2.) Those of them, who were still future when the apostles wrote, constitute as a body the great Antichrist of the last age. p. 360.

5. Such heretics being compared to the antediluvians, an apostate infidelity must have been the leading

badge of the times immediately preceding the deluge. p. 362.

II. The character of the messengers ascertained positively. p. 364.

1. The proper sense of the term *Angelus*, as it is here used by the apostles. p. 365.

(1.) It denotes *a sacerdotal messenger of Jehovah*. p. 365.

(2.) This view of the matter will explain several difficult passages of Scripture: such as 1 Corinth. xi. 10. 2 Corinth. xii 7. Rev. xii. 7, 8. p. 373.

2. An inquiry into what particular messengers of Jehovah are here meant by the apostles. p. 381.

(1.) They were priests, who had abdicated a sacerdotal empire, and who had migrated from their proper habitations. p. 381.

(2.) No such extraordinary event can be found, as occurring after the deluge. p. 384.

(3.) The priesthood, under the Patriarchal Dispensation, originally belonged to the first-born Cain: but he forfeited it by apostate infidelity and murder. It then devolved upon Seth and his posterity. p. 386.

(4.) The impious speculations of Cain were handed down to his descendants. p. 391.

(5.) In consequence of the excommunication of Cain, the antediluvians were divided into two communities: the first comprehending the children of Cain; the second, the children of Seth presiding as regal priests over the other descendants of Adam in the younger lines. p. 393.

(6.) The infection of infidelity gradually spread from the one community to the other. p. 395.

(7.) The Mosaical account of the apostasy and illicit marriages of those, who are styled *the sons of God*. p. 396.

(8.) These *sons of God* were the apostate Sethite priests: and they are *the angels* or *messengers* spoken of by St. Jude and St. Peter. p. 400.

III. Much light is thrown on the present subject by the Jewish historian Josephus. p. 403.

1. *The angels*, mentioned by that writer, are *the sons of God*, mentioned by Moses and *the apostate angels* mentioned by St. Jude and St. Peter. p. 405.

2. He relates, that their children performed the same deeds as those ascribed by the Greeks to the Titans and giants, and that Noah long fruitlessly attempted to reform them. p. 409.

(1.) The ministry of Noah solely respected the apostate *angeli* of the house of Seth. p. 410.

(2.) We have reason to believe, that these *angeli* made a daring attempt to storm the Paradisiacal mount of God. p. 414.

IV. The times, preceding the second advent of Christ, will resemble those which preceded the deluge. p. 423.

V. Homogeneity requires, that any other *angels*, mentioned by St. Jude and St. Peter in the course of the same passage, should be understood in the same manner as *the apostate angels*. p. 427.

1. The *Archangel* or *chief sacerdotal messenger* is Christ. p. 427.

2. The *angels*, spoken of as greater in power and might than the paganizing heretics of the apostolic age, are his faithful subordinate sacerdotal messengers. p. 428.

VI. Conclusion. p. 430.

BOOK I.

RESPECTING THE OBJECT

OF THE

PATRIARCHAL DISPENSATION.

CHAPTER I

ON THE PECULIAR GENIUS OF THE THREE DISPENSATIONS, PATRIARCHAL, LEVITICAL, AND CHRISTIAN.

From the time of the fall down to the termination of the world, man lives under one and the same system of divine grace: a system, which was rendered necessary for him by the very circumstance of the fall, and which therefore at no one period can differ essentially from itself.

Yet, as in the natural world things do but gradually reach perfection, so likewise is it in the moral world. The scheme of God's mercy commenced indeed with the promise, that *the seed of the woman should bruise the head of the serpent:* but it was successively developed from age to age, until that promised seed was manifested in the flesh at the day of his first advent; nor will it be absolutely consummated, until the Redeemer shall appear again in the day of his second advent to receive his saints into glory and to banish eternally from the divine presence his irreclaimable enemies.

Hence, as might be anticipated from the very reason of the thing, the single grand system of grace divides itself into several successive Dispensations, each of which has its own proper object suitable to the times in which it was promulgated. These successive Dispensations are three in number; the Patriarchal, the Levitical, and the Christian: and, as being equally component parts of one system, they are closely connected with each other in the way of a mutual dependence; Christ himself, the promised seed of the woman, being from first to last the sun of the entire system [1].

The object of the Christian Dispensation is so well known, that on that point I shall study conciseness: but the several objects of the two preceding Dispensations are not equally familiar. They form however a topic of very interesting inquiry: and the prosecution of such an inquiry will conduct us to various matters equally important and curious.

A discussion of this nature cannot be more fitly introduced, than by some preliminary remarks on the genius of those three successive Dispensations which constitute the three divisions of the single system of divine grace: for the genius and the object of each stand very closely connected.

I. During the term of the Patriarchal Dispen-

[1] See my Horæ Mosaic. book ii. 2d. Edit.

sation, the light of divine knowledge shone with abundantly sufficient lustre to have conducted ALL men to heaven, if they had not wilfully perverted their ways and turned aside from the revealed will of God. Its characteristic or genius therefore, like that of the Christian Dispensation, was UNIVERSALITY.

When our first parents deflected from their original integrity, a mighty Deliverer was foretold, who should enable them and all their descendants to triumph over their spiritual enemy, and who should provide them with ample means of being reconciled to their offended God.

There is considerable reason to believe, that both the peculiar character of this Deliverer, and the special mode by which he should restore fallen man to the divine favour, were explained with sufficient clearness to Adam and Eve: and there is also reason to suppose, that, at least until the time of the deluge, there was a permanent manifestation of Jehovah between the Cherubim at the eastern gate of Paradise, much in the same manner as at a subsequent period he permanently revealed his glory between these identical symbols within the Levitical sanctuary[1].

Under such circumstances, the Patriarchal Dispensation could not but be intended for

[1] See below book i. chap. 5, 6, 7. and Horæ Mosaic. book ii. sect. 1. chap. 1. § VII. 1. (7.)

UNIVERSALITY: because Adam after the creation, and Noah after the flood, would severally communicate, to ALL their children and their children's children, the knowledge which they themselves possessed respecting God's gracious purposes; and because no intimation is given, that this knowledge was to be confined to a particular family, while it was withheld from all the rest of mankind. Indeed, as from the beginning there could be no reason for any such confinement, and as each individual of whatsoever house was equally interested in the divine revelation; we might have anticipated from the very nature of things, that the Patriarchal Dispensation was *meant* to be UNIVERSAL. If it failed of becoming so *effectively*, the fault was in corrupt man himself.

1. When Adam and Eve were ejected from Paradise, it is natural to conclude, that they would not depart very far from the scene of their former happiness. *This*, I say, it would be natural to conclude, even if no light had been thrown upon the subject from Scripture. But Scripture *does* throw light upon it: and, at the same time, appears to mark with much precision, how very early the first apostasy commenced.

(1.) Cain, having speculatively rejected the use of typical bloody sacrifice, and having thought proper to substitute for it an oblation of the fruits of the earth, rejected, by that pre-

sumptuous act of will-worship, the rite which had been ordained as explanatory of the mode wherein the promised seed was to effect reconciliation between God and man: consequently, as knowing the purport and nature of bloody sacrifice, he rejected the mode of reconciliation itself. Hence his offering was unpleasant in the sight of Jehovah: and hence, while he was assured that he should be accepted provided he did well; he was admonished, that, as he did *not* well or was a sinner in the eyes of the Lord, he was forthwith to bring the victim which lay ready at the door as a sin-offering[1]. Cain however, instead of obeying the command of his God, slew his brother: and the result was a sentence of banishment from the divine presence. The murderer, we are told, *went out from the presence of Jehovah, and dwelt in a land of wandering on the east of Eden*[2].

Now what was this *presence*, from which he went out? It is not said, that the divine apparition of Jehovah departed from Cain, but that Cain went out from the presence of Jehovah: and, as the murderer went *out* and dwelt erratically in a land to the east of Eden; the obvious conclusion is, that he had previously dwelt *in* the land of Eden and therefore *in* the immediate vicinity of Paradise. The divine apparition

[1] See Horæ Mosaic. book ii. sect. 3. chap. 2. § I. 2.

[2] Gen. iv. 16.

then was manifested *in the vicinity of Paradise:* and, from *its presence,* Cain went out into a land of wandering. The apparition, consequently, was *permanent* in the spot where Jehovah had conversed with Cain: for it was *Cain,* not *the apparition,* who departed. But, in the immediate vicinity of Paradise, namely at its eastern gate, were stationed the Cherubim: and, when Cain left the vicinity of Paradise, he fled into a land which lay to the east of Eden. Hence, I think, putting all these matters together, and recollecting that under the Levitical Dispensation Jehovah was wont to manifest his presence between the Cherubim; we seem almost inevitably brought to the following conclusion: that Jehovah, as under the Law of Moses, *permanently* revealed himself between the Cherubim at the eastern gate of Paradise; that the oblations of Cain and Abel were *brought,* as the sacred historian most accurately expresses himself, to be devoted *in the presence of Jehovah thus permanently revealed;* that, when after the murder (which took place *in the field,* whither the two brethren had gone subsequent to their sacrificing *in the presence of Jehovah*[1]) Cain again appeared as

[1] See Gen. iv. 8. where the Samaritan and the Greek have excellently preserved a clause, which does not now appear in the Hebrew. *And Cain said unto Abel his brother,* LET US GO INTO THE FIELD: *and it came to pass, when they were in the field, that Cain rose up against Abel his brother and slew him.* Now, if Cain *immediately after* the sacrifice said to his

usual to worship in this same *presence of Jehovah*, the sentence of banishment was pronounced upon him by an audible voice from between the Cherubim; and that finally he *went out*, still from the same *divine presence*, when he fled in a direct line from the eastern gate of Paradise to the eastern land of his future wandering, the apparition of Jehovah remaining all the while *permanent* between the Cherubic symbols.

(2.) The secession of Cain produced a marked distinction between the servants of God and the servants of the evil one.

His secession, *effectively* at least, amounted to an excommunication; for we hear nothing of his repentance: and, when he was excluded from the divine presence, before which his parents and in due time the house of his brother Seth continued to worship; this excommunication, which he sought not to remove, would rapidly mature, in the persons of himself and his descendants, to avowed apostasy of some description or another.

Respecting the precise nature of this apostasy, we doubtless cannot speak *quite decidedly:* yet,

brother *Let us go into the field*, it is plain, that their respective oblations were not devoted *in* the field but in some *other* place. But that *other* place must be the place, whither they *brought* their offerings: and it is difficult to conceive where *that* could be, if it were not a consecrated inclosure before that *presence of Jehovah* (ver. 16.) whence Cain afterwards *went out* into a land of wandering.

though Maimonides, probably from Jewish tradition, thinks, that it consisted in worshipping the host of heaven, first conjunctively with God, and afterwards exclusively of him[1]; I much suspect, as we shall see more at large hereafter, that the leading characteristic of the apostasy may be traced to the opinion not equivocally avowed by Cain in the mere eucharistic quality of his sacrifice[2]. Deeming it utterly irrational, that Jehovah, revealed in the form of a man and born from the womb of a woman, should become a piacular oblation for the sins of the world; a doctrine, figuratively set forth in the promise to our first parents, and literally (if I mistake not) explained to them by the oracle of God: deeming this irrational and incredible, he was led, consistently enough, to reject the typical piacular bloody sacrifice, and to substitute for it a mere eucharistic offering of vegetables. Cain, in short, discarded the doctrine of *the atonement;* though he could not but believe, because his own eyes had witnessed the fact, that the Voice or Word of Jehovah was accustomed to reveal himself in a human form[3]: and his own speculations, which he evidently did not give up, because he did not bring an animal-offering;

[1] Maimon. de Idol. See the passage at large in my Dissert. on the Mysteries of the Cabiri, vol. i. p. 10, 11.

[2] See below book i. chap. 7. § II. 2.

[3] See Horæ Mosaic. book ii. sect. i. chap. 2.

though graciously admonished on the subject by the Lord[1]; his own speculations he would naturally carry with him into his banishment, and would hand them down to his posterity. Hence I am inclined to believe, that *the rejection of an atonement by the sacrifice of the virgin-born Man-Jehovah* was the special characteristic of the antediluvian apostasy, and that its external badge was *the entire discarding of bloody piacular sacrifices and the systematic adoption of vegetable eucharistic offerings.* It affected to be a philosophical scheme of theology: and it claimed to be far more accordant with right reason, than the scheme which Jehovah himself had marked out.

As for its advocates, they seem to have made very considerable advancement in the arts and sciences[2]: but its practical effects closely resembled the fruits, which a not dissimilar infidel philosophy has produced in the course of the antichristian French Revolution. Its projector was the first murderer upon record: and, when the whole house of Seth, save a single family, went over to the rebel rout, we are told, that *the earth was corrupt before God and the earth was filled with violence*[3]. Unbridled profligacy of manners, and lavish profusion of blood, marked the antediluvian philosophy of the Cainites, as it

[1] Gen. iv. 7. See my Orig. of Pagan Idol. book ii. chap. 8. § II. 4.

[2] Gen. iv. 21, 22.

[3] Gen. vi. 11.

has since equally marked the kindred postdiluvian philosophy of the self-intitled Illuminated. The very germ of sound religion, of the only religion suitable to *fallen* man, was destroyed. A vaunting pretence to superior light excluded all possibility of repentance and reformation. Nothing was left but utter excision, lest the small sincere part should at length be drawn away by the multitude[1].

I think it not improbable, if we may judge from the heathen legends which have come down to us, that some audacious attempt at persecution was made even in the very presence of Jehovah enthroned between the Cherubim, and that the close of the antediluvian world was marked by some presumptuous effort to occupy the Paradisiacal mount of God[2]: but, however this may be, I am the more confirmed in my opinion respecting the primeval apostasy by the remarkable language employed by our Lord. *As the days of Noah were, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be*[3]. The antediluvians were

[1] Thus Ovid speaks very accurately (I believe) in describing the state of things at that period.

Cuncta prius tentata: sed immedicabile vulnus
Ense recidendum, ne pars sincera trahatur.

Metam. lib. i. ver. 190, 191.

[2] Hesiod. Theog. ver. 617—745. Ovid. Metam. lib. i. ver. 150—152. Origin of Pagan Idol. book iii. chap. 3. § I. See below book i. chap. 7. § III. 2. (2.)

[3] Matt. xxiv. 37.

immersed in dissolute pleasure; and *knew not*, that is to say, *believed not* (for they could not but *know*, that the just man had been foretelling the catastrophè of the deluge full a hundred and twenty years before its occurrence): they *believed not until the flood came and took them all away*. Infidelity then was their characteristic: and, accordingly, our Saviour foretells (what we may now see rapidly accomplishing), that the days, immediately preceding his second advent, should be eminently marked by a want of religious faith[1]. Men, in fine, of the very same principles distinguish the time before the flood and the time before the second advent.

2. With the deluge ended the first period of the Patriarchal Church: and, after that catastrophè, it again became UNIVERSAL in the family and immediate descendants of Noah. But, ere long, another apostasy took place; though, I am inclined to think, of a radically different nature from that, which was advocated by the posterity of Cain.

We have reason to believe, that the antediluvian apostasy was characterized by a rejection of the doctrine of *the atonement* and by a consequent rejection of bloody sacrifice: the very reverse of this heresy strongly marked the postdiluvian apostasy.

The frequent and well-remembered appear

[1] Luke xviii. 8.

ances of the Word of Jehovah in a human form soon led to Hero-Worship: and Hero-Worship was, from the first, immediately associated with astronomical superstition. But, depraved as the theology of the Gentiles might be subsequent to the era of the Babylonic tower, it never, with some few exceptions, lost sight of the grand doctrine of *the atonement*. Adam, Enoch, Noah, and other eminent persons, were thought to have been permanent manifestations of the divine Word. Hence they were all deemed to be various transmigrative appearances of one and the same Being: and hence their several histories are most curiously engrafted on the character of the promised Seed of the woman[1]. But, with this abuse (what indeed was the natural result of such a mixture), the belief, both in the necessity of bloody piacular sacrifice, and in some remarkable divine victim who was mystically shadowed out by all other victims, was strenuously avowed and maintained. Dreadful indeed was the corruption of the tenet; for I doubt not, that the once universally-prevalent rite of human sacrifice sprang immediately from the acknowledged doctrine, that the Man-Jehovah, whom they confounded with their ancestorial Hero-gods, was himself to become a piacular victim: yet, dreadful as it was, the tenet, *as*

[1] Origin of Pagan Idol. book vi. chap. 6. See below book i. chap. 6.

a tenet, was held precisely in the same manner as it is authoritatively recognized under both the Levitical and the Christian Dispensation. The postdiluvian apostates, even while lapsing into gross idolatry, still taught, that, *without shedding of blood there is no remission of sins;* still taught, that, however right it might be to offer up occasionally *eucharistic* sacrifices, the wrath of the immortal gods could only be appeased by the due oblation of *piacular* sacrifices.

II. Under these circumstances, it is evident, that utter excision was no way necessary, as it had heretofore been. The grand peculiarity of a religion suitable to fallen man was carefully preserved in the degenerate Patriarchal Church. The apostates rejected not the doctrine of *the atonement*, though they had lamentably perverted the religion of their fathers. Reformation therefore, and not utter excision, was determined upon in the counsels of God; agreeably to that foreknowledge, which led him to declare, that *the waters should no more become a flood to destroy all flesh.*

1. But in what manner could this reformation be best effected? God's wrath against the apostates had already been displayed at Babel: yet no amendment followed. The corruption, which they had excogitated while bound together in a single body politic, they bore with them to every part of the globe, when they were dispersed over the face of the whole earth.

How then could they be reclaimed? How was a depraved system, now become universal, to be overturned?

It is manifest, that unless Jehovah had been pleased to violate the established order of his moral government, by working such an endless series of miracles, as should *compel* the dispersed in all parts of the world to reject the evil and to embrace the good: it is manifest, I say, that, unless this plan had been adopted which is wholly unsuitable to creatures in a state of probation, nothing remained but to provide means, which by slow degrees should train men to a better way of thinking and acting. Wise as he was in his own speculations, man had shewn himself to be intellectually a mere child. It was fit therefore, that he should be treated as a child: it was fit, that a schoolmaster should be provided; and that thus he should at length be brought to that Messiah, whom he never indeed ceased to desire, though he had most strangely and obstinately perverted his real character[1].

Now this is the precise manner, in which God through his infinite wisdom was pleased to act. At a proper time, he called his servant Abraham from among the astronomically idolatrous Chusdim of Babylonia; and destined him to be the patriarch of a nation, to which a fresh theolo-

[1] Gal. iii. 24, 25. Haggai ii. 7.

gical Dispensation was to be committed. By the various sojournings of this eminent person and his immediate descendants, a strong testimony against the prevailing abuses would be borne through a considerable part of the East: but, when all was insufficient to check the torrent, and when the last glimmering of divine light was scarcely apparent in the now rapidly expiring Patriarchal Church; the new Dispensation, which was to prepare the way for a vast moral and religious change throughout the whole world, was inaugurated by the ministry of a heaven-commissioned prophet. As the characteristic of the Patriarchal Church was UNIVERSALITY; so the characteristic of the Levitical Church was, from the very necessity of the case, PARTICULARITY. A single people was chosen out of the corrupt mass, in order that they might be depositaries of the truth. But that truth was still the same truth, as what had shone out conspicuously in the unadulterated Patriarchal Church. Hence it follows, that, while Paganism is but Patriarchism in grotesque and unhallowed masquerade: so Judaism is the same Patriarchism, reclaimed from abuse, decorated with various new rites and solemnities, and confined for a season to one peculiar people[1].

2. This PARTICULARITY, viewed as the spe-

[1] See Origin of Pagan Idol. book vi. chap. 6.

cial characteristic of the Levitical Dispensation, is remarkably pointed out by Balaam in one of his predictions delivered to Balak.

From the top of the rocks I see him; and from the hills I behold him: lo, the people shall dwell ALONE, *and shall not be reckoned among the nations*[1].

The house of Israel was long kept in a secluded state, the depositary of God's word and promises, the seed of a future abundant harvest of righteousness. They had little intercourse, save with the immediately contiguous tribes: and, in reckoning up the great nations of the earth, their name occurs not. The very drift of their institutes was to accomplish and secure this seclusion: for, as yet, the benighted pagan world was not in a condition to receive divine truth without perverting it. Even when the Saviour *did* appear, he was speedily throughout the East identified with that imaginary divinity, whose character is formed by a traditional combination of the woman's Seed with the ancient patriarchs[2]. Hence, had he manifested himself at an earlier period, when the drift of the lately established pagan theology was more fully and generally understood; it is obvious, that he

[1] Numb. xxiii. 9. The same striking circumstance is foretold also by Moses, *Israel shall dwell in safety* ALONE. Deut. xxxiii. 28.

[2] See Horæ Mosaic. book ii. sect. 2. chap. 2. See also below, book i. chap. 6. § IV.

would have been viewed in no other light than as one of the numerous incarnate descents of the often appearing god of Gentilism: and thus a Dispensation, which was designed to reform the world and to reclaim it from lying vanities, would soon have been perversely accommodated to the prevailing notions of the age.

3. As the time however was drawing near when the day-spring from on high should visit us, the characteristic of PARTICULARITY, so far as not altogether to destroy its very constitution, began to be withdrawn from the Levitical Church.

The Sun of righteousness was about to rise upon the Gentiles: and, like the natural sun, he was preceded by a twilight. Through the medium of the Babylonic captivity, the truth was carried far into the East: by the emigration of numerous Jews into Egypt and into various regions of Asia, it was borne likewise into those several countries: the translation of the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek offered facilities for the acquisition of divine knowledge not hitherto enjoyed by the Pagans: and many proselytes to the worship of Jehovah, though not descended from the stock of Abraham, were received with gradually increasing numbers into the pale of the Levitical Church.

Such were the preparatory steps to the abolition of Paganism; which, however monstrous it might become in its progress, was at the first,

as it is well styled by one of the fathers, a heresy from the Patriarchal Church rather than an entirely new system of theology[1].

III. The Levitical Dispensation being altogether of a preparatory nature, and it being the merciful purpose of God to reclaim mankind from those errors and abuses into which they had fallen; the Dispensation, for which it served to prepare the way, was of necessity, like the Patriarchal, marked by the characteristic of UNIVERSALITY.

Christianity, in fact, is but the completion of Patriarchism; while the Law serves as the connecting chain between them. Under Patriarchism, ALL men were taught to look forward to the promised Deliverer; who should be Jehovah manifest in a human form, who should bruise the head of the serpent, and who should himself become a sacrifice for sin: under Christianity, ALL men are taught to rejoice in the actual appearance of that same promised Deliverer, who has now done and suffered every thing that was predicted of him. UNIVERSALITY is still the characteristic of each: for, as Patriarchism is anticipated Christianity, so Christianity is perfected Patriarchism.

Yet, such is the reluctance of man to be reformed, as Patriarchism in a sincere state failed

[1] Epiph. adv. hær. lib. i. p. 6, 8, 9. See Origin of Pagan Idol. book vi. chap. 2. § IV. 1.

to be *effectively* universal, in consequence of two successive apostasies, antediluvian and post-diluvian: so Christianity has hitherto similarly failed to be *effectively* universal through the hardness and depravity of the human heart, which refuses to admit it.

But the purpose of the Almighty is still powerfully, though silently, working. In the appointed time of God, *the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea*[1]. When the two great apostasies of Popery and Mohammedism shall have been broken, when Antichrist shall have been brought to his end none helping him, and when the whole house of Israel shall have been converted and restored to their own land; at that period will be accomplished the general reformation of the old pagan heresy. Without any mischievous attempt to corrupt the doctrine of *an atonement, effected by a virgin-born divinity,* Christ will be universally acknowledged as that promised Seed of the woman, who has so long been traditionally remembered by the erring Gentiles: and, as a present Jehovah was alike manifested between the Cherubim at the gate of Paradise and between the Cherubim in the Levitical sanctuary; so there are passages, which seem not obscurely to intimate, that, in the last age of the Christian Church, a similar manifestation of

[1] Isaiah xi. 9.

the incarnate Word, radiant in all the divine effulgence of the Shechinah, will take place in the holy mountain of God[1]. Here, as from a throne, there is some reason to believe, that the Man-Jehovah will preside oracularly, a visible spiritual king, over his obedient people; until the world shall be finally devastated by a deluge of fire, as it was heretofore submerged beneath a deluge of water. At the close of the postdiluvian world, as at the close of the antediluvian world, a race of lawless Titans will spring up; who shall brave even the high majesty of heaven itself, and who shall attempt to storm the Paradisiacal city of the apparent Godhead. But Jehovah will thunder upon them from heaven; and fire will go forth from his presence to devour them[2]. Then, under the agency of a new and more terrible flood than that of old, *the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat; the earth also, and the works that are therein, shall be burned up*[3]. Yet from this general conflagration, by a better mundane *anacenosis* than that of the fabulizing Gentiles, shall spring a renovated and purer

[1] Isaiah lxvi. 15, 19, 23. Ezek. xliii. 2—7. Zechar. xii. 8, 10. xiv. 3, 4, 9. Malach. iii. 1—4. viewed with an ultimate reference to the conversion of Judah. Matt. xxiv. 30. Mark xiii. 26. Luke xxi. 27. Acts i. 11. iii. 21. 2 Thessal. ii. 8. Rev. xx. 4, 6.

[2] Rev. xx. 7—11.

[3] 2 Peter iii. 10—12.

world, the appointed celestial mansion of the glorified human race[1]. *According to God's promise, we look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness*[2]. In this blissful abode, whatever may be the true opinion respecting its locality, the incarnate Jehovah will dwell with men, and they shall be his people.

Thus, from first to last, under the three successive Dispensations, Patriarchal, Levitical, and Christian, has God been carrying on one consistent and harmonious scheme of grace and mercy for the salvation of his fallen creatures.

[1] *In my Father's house are* MANY *mansions.* John xiv. 2. Since we are taught to hold *the resurrection of the body*; our bodies, however refined and glorified, will still be *material.* But, if they will still be *material*; they must, to all appearance at least, have a local habitation and a name, itself *material* no less than *they* are. When we gaze upon the stupendous vault of heaven studded with innumerable suns, and when we argue analogically from what we *know* of God's works to what we do *not* know: I see nothing extravagant or improbable in the supposition, that some of those MANY celestial mansions, the existence of which our Lord so expressly declares, are even now within the reach of mortal ken. A doctrine, not dissimilar to this, was held by the ancient Pagans: and, however they may have corrupted it to the purposes of their favourite Heröolatry, the groundwork of their opinion may have been derived from the old Patriarchal Church.

[2] 2 Peter iii. 13.

CHAPTER II.

AN EXAMINATION OF THE THEORY OF BISHOP WARBURTON, RELATIVE TO THE STATE OF MAN FROM HIS FIRST CREATION TO THE PROMULGATION OF THE LAW.

THE genius of the Patriarchal Dispensation was UNIVERSALITY: what its special object was, remains still to be discussed. But, before I proceed to this topic and the matters dependent upon it, it will be proper to examine the theory of Bishop Warburton, relative to the state of man from his original creation down to the era of the promulgation of the Law from mount Sinai: for, if that theory be well founded, the Patriarchal Dispensation is in truth a non-entity.

According to this learned prelate, Adam and Eve were not placed in Paradise immediately upon their creation, but existed during a period of undefined length in an anteparadisiacal state. While they were thus circumstanced, they were kept under the tutelage of natural, as contra-distinguished from revealed, religion: and were liable to the death of the body and to the annihilation of the soul, having been created in their

original constitution not immortal but mortal; so that, if they had remained in this their primitive condition, they would at length have died through mere old age just as we ourselves do, unless God had interposed to preserve them alive after a manner no less miraculous than any such interposition would be at present. It pleased the Supreme Being, however, to remove them from this original state of mortality and natural religion to a state of immortality and revealed religion: and he effected it, when he removed them into Paradise. Here they became, for the first time, subject to the controul of positive or revealed religion: and here too, for the first time, they became immortal. Yet was the grant of immortality not absolute, but conditional. By way of probation, this high privilege, which was originally extrinsic from their condition, was suspended upon the observance or non-observance of an arbitrary precept. If they obeyed, they were to live for ever: if they disobeyed, they would sink back to their primeval and natural state of mortality. Unhappily for themselves and their posterity, they transgressed the commandment: and the consequence was, that they were brought back to the condition in which they had been originally created; for they again became mortal, and were again subjected to the law of nature as contradistinguished from the law of revelation. This second subjection to the law of

nature continued to the time of Moses; when a revealed law, though of limited operation, was delivered through his agency from mount Sinai. During the intermediate period from Adam to Moses, man had indeed occasional communications with God: but, inasmuch as a sentence of mortality had been solemnly pronounced upon him after the fall, and inasmuch as that sentence was believed to extend to the soul as well as to the body, the doctrine of a future state of rewards and punishments was generally unknown by the predecessors of Moses before the promulgation of the Law, just as it was generally unknown by the Israelites after the promulgation of the Law. Now, if virtue meet with no reward, and if vice meet with no punishment, either here or hereafter: every idea of a moral governor of the world is immediately obliterated, and every restraint is removed from the wayward and violent passions of fallen man. But, in the apprehension of those who flourished during the patriarchal ages from Adam to Moses, virtue had no reward, and vice had no punishment, hereafter. Therefore, in order to prevent a total obliteration of all idea of a moral governor, and in order to save the very frame of society from falling to pieces through the inordinate and wholly unrestrained passions of its constituent members, it became necessary, that virtue should be rewarded, and that vice should be punished, here. This circumstance, in the

course of God's all-wise administration, produced the phenomenon of an equal or miraculous or extraordinary Providence; by which, during the patriarchal ages, no less than under the Hebrew Theocracy, good men were universally rewarded, and bad men were universally punished, in this present world: for, as a visible and palpable reward, such as marked and eminent prosperity, never failed to be the consequence of virtue; so a visible and palpable punishment, such as remarkable sickness or pain or death or adversity, always dogged the heels of vice[1].

Such is the theory of Bishop Warburton: and we may easily, I think, perceive, that it sprang out of that other leading theory, which forms the basis of his entire work. Had he not first maintained the ignorance of the Israelites respecting a future state of rewards and punishments, we should never have heard any thing respecting the alleged similar ignorance of their predecessors and the various matters connected with that alleged ignorance. For let us observe the mutual relation and dependence of the whole.

The reason, why he maintained the operation of an equal Providence during the patriarchal ages, was its absolute necessity to his dogma,

[1] Divine Legat. book ix. chap. 1. p. 243, 246—260, 263, 264—268. Notes p. 377. in Works 8vo. edit. vol. vi.

that a future retributory state was throughout the entire duration of those ages generally unknown. For, if the early inhabitants of the earth before and after the deluge were ignorant of a future state of retribution, and if at the same time they observed the constant operation of an unequal Providence such as now exists in every quarter of the globe; they undoubtedly, from so total a want of any indication of a moral governor of the world, must soon have lapsed universally into complete lawlessness and absolute atheism.

And the reason again, why he contended, that a future state of retribution was generally unknown throughout the patriarchal ages, was its no less absolute necessity to the tenet which forms the basis of his great and elaborate work: the tenet namely, that a future state of retribution was generally unknown to the Israelites under the Levitical Dispensation. For, if a future state of retribution had been generally known and believed from Adam to Moses, it would have been utterly incredible, that the Israelites should have been ignorant of it any more than their predecessors. Granting even in the amplest manner that their own prophet was silent on the subject, still we may be sure, as the bishop was fully aware, that *his* mere silence could not possibly annihilate *already existing* knowledge. Hence the learned prelate found it altogether necessary to withhold from

the patriarchal ages that knowledge, which he denied to the Israelites under the Levitical Dispensation.

This, rather than any satisfactory evidence which could be brought from Scripture itself, was the true cause, I shrewdly suspect, why he placed the early inhabitants of the earth under the administration of an equal Providence, why he brought them back after the fall into a state of natural religion, and why he withheld from them the knowledge of a future state of retribution. His leading theory stood or fell with this alleged condition of the patriarchal ages.

It is obvious, that such an opinion, if valid, demolishes at one blow what we have always been accustomed to denominate *the Patriarchal Dispensation:* for, if nothing save mere natural religion subsisted from the fall to the promulgation of the Hebrew Law, there was plainly no such thing as *any* Patriarchal Dispensation; unless indeed the system of revealed religion, under which our first parents lived for a short time in Paradise, may be so called; and, even then, nothing of the sort will have existed during the whole period, which elapsed between the fall and the promulgation of the Law from mount Sinai. Hence, both on this account, and on account of the doctrines which it involves, we may well, ere we admit it, claim the right of sifting it to the bottom article by article.

The exclusive existence of natural religion in

the world is ascribed, in the theory of the bishop, to two periods: the first is the period occupied by the alleged anteparadisiacal state of Adam and Eve; the second is the period, which elapsed from the fall down to the revelation of the Hebrew Law from mount Sinai. These two periods shall be considered in their order, that we may see whether we can discover within their respective limits the matters attributed to them by Bishop Warburton.

I. The first period is that, which is occupied by the alleged anteparadisiacal state of Adam and Eve.

Now, during this period, according to the bishop, Adam and Eve, having been originally created subject to death and annihilation, possessed not the high privilege of immortality: and, during the same period, no revelation having as yet been made of God's will, they were kept under the sole tutelage of natural religion.

1. The position, that Adam and Eve were originally created subject to death and annihilation, and consequently that they possessed not from the beginning the privilege of immortality, is proved by the bishop in the following argument.

Immortality was not bestowed upon our first parents until they were brought into Paradise, the privilege itself being then conferred as a free gift. Therefore their existence, anterior to the conferring of the free gift of immortality,

must have been an existence in a condition of mortality[1].

(1.) The singular inaccuracy of the statement, upon which this argument is built, will at once be seen by any person who turns to the Mosaical narrative.

One might well imagine from the language of the bishop, that the inspired historian had given a full and unambiguous account, how the boon of immortality was bestowed on the first pair when they were admitted into Paradise: but, in good truth, not a single syllable is said respecting this supposed donation. We are not told, that the gift of immortality was conveyed to Adam and Eve *subsequent* to their creation: but we are told, that they were threatened with the penalty of death in case they should taste the fruit of a certain forbidden tree[2]. Now from such an account I should incline to draw a conclusion the very opposite to that of Bishop Warburton. Since no new gift of immortality is so much as once mentioned, and since man is simply threatened with death upon the breach of a positive commandment, I should conceive the obvious inference to be: not that immortality was then for the first time *bestowed* upon Adam and Eve, but that *the loss* of it was announced in the event of their disobedience. If

[1] Div. Leg. book ix. chap. 1. p. 242, 243.

[2] Gen. ii. 16, 17. iii. 2, 3.

then they were simply threatened with *the loss* of it, they must have already *possessed* it: for how could they *lose* that, which all the while they did not *possess?* But Moses is entirely silent, as to any particular time *subsequent* to their creation when the gift of immortality was bestowed upon them. Hence, so far as the sacred record is concerned, I see not how we can avoid the necessity of concluding, that they were *originally created* immortal. For, since the Bible is quite silent as to any *subsequent* communication of the gift, and since the threat of death inevitably implies a previous freedom from liability to death: we have surely no warrant for asserting, that Adam *became* immortal at this time or at that time *after* his creation. Such being the case, I see not where we can consistently look for the commencement of his immortality, save to his original creation itself. But, if the first pair were *created* immortal, then they cannot have existed in a mortal condition during any supposed anteparadisiacal state[1].

[1] Yet, though Adam came forth immortal from the hands of his Maker, I think we may gather not obscurely, that the mode, in which his immortality was to be perpetuated, differed from that in which the immortality of the blessed angels is perpetuated.

The attribute of immortality is either *independent* or *dependent*. God alone possesses *an independent immortality;* that is to say, *an immortality which requires not to be sus-*

(2.) As the bishop's assertion, that man was *originally* created mortal and that immortality

tained by any extrinsic communications. All created beings, who are constituted immortal, possess but *a dependent immortality;* that is to say, *an immortality which requires to be sustained by extrinsic communications, and which therefore ceases when those extrinsic communications are withdrawn.* As for the specific nature of the communications themselves, it matters but little; for the grand distinction is between *independent* and *dependent* mortality. Adam before the fall, and the angels from the day of their creation, equally possessed a *dependent* mortality, as contradistinguished from the *independent* immortality of God. So far therefore they resembled each other, because they alike possessed an immortality of the same species: but, while the immortality of both was equally characterized by its *dependence upon extrinsic communications,* nothing hinders that those extrinsic communications should be severally very different. And such, I apprehend, we shall find to have been actually the case.

In what manner the dependent immortality of angels is sustained, we are no where positively told: most probably, as the frown of the Almighty could at once annihilate them or (in other words) deprive them of their immortality, so the favour of the Almighty is that perpetual though imperceptible communication, through which they live and move and have their being. But, man being a compound animal, it seems to have pleased the Deity, that the mode, in which the immortality of at least his body should be sustained, should be adapted to the nature of his material organs; and consequently that it should differ from the mode, in which the immortality of absolute ethereal spirits is sustained. We know, that, even *since* the fall, our bodies are capable of being supported to a certain age by the use of suitable food: and we know too, that that age is by no means *physically* limited as at present to the term of seventy or eighty years;

was *afterwards* conferred upon him in Paradise, is wholly unsupported by the inspired narrative:

there was a period, when the human race, though mortal, attained to as many centuries as they now reach decades. Hence analogically there is no difficulty in conceiving the existence of a food, which should be of so potent and salutary a nature as to perpetuate the body which used it through the countless ages of eternity itself. Nor would an immortality thus sustained differ from the immortality of the Angels in any respect, save in *the particular mode* of its sustenance. Each immortality would be alike *dependent* upon extrinsic communications: the sole difference would be in *the manner*, after which those communications were made; and I need scarcely observe, that, throughout the wide limits of the universe, *the modes* of sustaining dependent immortality by extrinsic communications may be almost infinitely varied. Now, so far as we can learn from Scripture, *the particular mode*, in which the dependent immortality of man was to be sustained, was by eating at certain intervals the restorative fruit of the tree of life; just as *the particular mode*, in which the dependent immortality of the angels is sustained, seems to be by the imperceptible communication of God's vivifying and upholding Spirit: for we are told, that after the fall *the Lord God said, Behold the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil; and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take of the tree of life, and* LIVE FOR EVER. (Gen. iii. 22.) Here we see, that the immortality of Adam is immediately connected with the tree of life: whence apparently it will follow, that, through the use of its fruit, the corporeal life of Adam was to be for ever perpetuated; and, consequently, that, through the disuse of it he was to become corporeally mortal, much after the same manner as death at present will be the speedy result of a total abstinence from food.

Whether this mysterious tree operated sacramentally upon the soul, as well as mechanically upon the body, we cannot

so does it accord very ill with the account of death, which is given in other parts of Scripture.

Death is universally represented to us, as *the exclusive penalty or wages of sin*[1]. Whence it is hard to say what can follow, but that, as death came into the world *by* sin, so *without* sin it never *would* have come into the world. Death, in short, so far as the human species is concerned, is always spoken of as a *punishment*. But how can it be a *punishment*, if man *might* have been subjected to it without the commission of any sin?

That I have not misrepresented the theory of the learned prelate, is abundantly clear: for he expressly teaches us, that man was originally created *mortal*. We know however on the highest authority, that *God* originally *made man*

positively say: some such thing may seem to be insinuated by the prophet of the Apocalypse; but I pretend not to enter minutely into these obscure matters. (See Rev. xxii. 2. and Bishop Horne's Sermons, vol. i. disc. 3). Sufficient it is for my purpose to have shown, that, so far as Scripture throws any light upon the subject, the immortality of Adam was conferred upon him at his creation, not bestowed upon him at some subsequent period, after he had been brought into Paradise: though the appointed mean of sustaining it, at least the immortality of the body, was by mechanically eating at certain intervals the fruit of the tree of life.

[1] Rom. vi. 23. v. 12—21. vii. 5, 10, 13. viii. 2, 6. 1 Corinth. xv. 21, 22. James i. 15.

upright[1]. Therefore, according to the bishop, man, who was *originally* made upright, was nevertheless *originally* created mortal: or, in other words, man, though *originally* made upright, was *from the first* doomed to undergo the punishment of death, notwithstanding he had hitherto done nothing to deserve that decidedly penal infliction. His lordship, it is true, maintains, that immortality was *afterwards* bestowed upon him in Paradise: but this does not invalidate his first position and the consequences which flow from it. If we suppose, that man was originally created *mortal;* we are quite at liberty to suppose also, that God *might* never have been pleased to confer upon him the gift of *immortality*. And then what will be the consequence? Plainly this. Man, according to his *original* constitution, would have *equally* died, whether he had sinned, or whether he had not sinned. But, if such would *alike* have been his fate, whatever was his moral and religious conduct; it is difficult to conceive, how death could properly be represented as a *punishment*.

The bishop might indeed have urged, that it *became* a punishment in consequence of man's receiving the gift of immortality: and this, in fact, is all that *can* be urged. But to my own mind, at least, it is strangely unsatisfactory.

[1] Eccles. vii. 29.

For I know not how to conceive, that the strict and perfect justice of a holy and offended God should impose no greater punishment upon *an audacious transgressor*, than the mere reduction of him to the identical state, in which he was originally created, and in which he lived (as the bishop tells us) several years *without being guilty of any transgression whatsoever*. According to this hypothesis, a *sinless* being was created *liable* to death; whence he *might* have died, even though he had continued *sinless*: and yet a *sinful* being receives no higher punishment, than a reduction to that very state which he once occupied even while *sinless*.

(3.) It is much to be regretted, that, by omitting to give an accurate definition of the term *mortality*, the bishop should have so greatly obscured and perplexed his whole argument.

The term itself, without such a definition, is plainly ambiguous: for it may mean, either *the death of the body while the merely separated soul remains unextinguished*, or, *the joint death both of body and of soul through the operation of which death each alike is extinguished or annihilated*. So far however as I am able to follow this great writer in his elaborate argument, he seems to intend, by the term in question, *the joint death both of body and of soul;* or, in other words, *an utter extinction or annihilation of the whole compound being denominated* MAN. Accordingly, I have thus stated and argued the question before us.

What then is the consequence of such an opinion, when brought into play even by the bishop himself?

The penalty of death, denounced upon Adam, has generally been deemed correspondent to the two lives, animal and spiritual, with which he was endowed at his creation: whence death of the body has been supposed to mean an extinction of animal life; while death of the soul has been viewed, not as its utter annihilation, but as that total corruption of its nature and that consequential exclusion from the divine presence which we are taught in Scripture to call *the second death*.

To this the bishop objects, that we have no right to draw such an inference, in regard to the condition of the soul, from the naked term *death;* which elsewhere is perpetually used by Moses to express only *the death of the body* or *the mere extinction of animal life*.

Let us then grant the propriety of his objection: and who does not immediately perceive, to what a retort he lays himself open? If, from the naked term *death* employed by Moses, we have no right to infer the *additional* penalty of *the second death*: what right can the bishop have to infer, from the very same term *death*, the *additional* penalty of *the annihilation of the soul*? Moses, we are told, uses *death* simply do denote *the extinction of animal life*. Be it so: but then it will plainly follow, that, if from such a term

we are not warranted in extracting the doctrine of *a future state of punishment*, we are just as little warranted in extracting the doctrine of *the annihilation of the soul.*

The opinion, in fact, for which Bishop Warburton contends; the opinion namely, that *man was first created with a mortal soul and body*, and that *to this his original condition he was brought back by the fall:* such an opinion, if it can be proved at all, must be proved *extrinsically* from the text, which announces *death* as the penalty of Adam's transgression. Those divines, who differ from his lordship, do not attempt to demonstrate the doctrine of *exclusion from the divine presence* through the medium of the text in question: they rather infer it, as a necessary consequence; partly from their being unable to discover in Scripture any indication that by the fall Adam's soul became mortal, and partly from the immutable nature of God's attributes which can tolerate nothing that is unholy. For, if the soul of Adam retained its immortality though his body became mortal, and if that soul received a deep pollution of sin through rebellious transgression: they suppose it to follow inevitably, unless a remedy could be found, that such a soul, *because* unholy, must in the very nature of things be for ever excluded from the presence of God[1].

[1] See Horæ Mosaic. book i. sect. i. chap. 3. § II.

(4.) I am perfectly aware, that the bishop *attempts* indeed to prove his point *extrinsically:* with what success, is another question.

Adam, says he, *disobeyed the command. He ate; and became, as he was first created,* MORTAL. *Lest, as the historian says, he should put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever; he is driven out of Paradise, and sent back again to his former state, the subject of natural religion. And in this subjection he continued till the giving of the Law*[1].

Now, in the bishop's sense of the word MORTAL, where is the proof of all this? That the man became liable to *death,* is clear: but that is not precisely the point. The question is, whether the expression used by Moses in the text before us, *and live for ever,* when joined with the preceding negative *lest,* MUST denote *the annihilation of the soul as well as the death of the body,* or whether it MAY not denote *the death of the body alone.* So far as I can judge, the phrase, *lest he live for ever,* may just as properly express *eternal life in the body* as *eternal life out of the body:* whence I see not, what right we have to infer from it *the annihilation of the soul* as constituting any part of the denounced penalty. The text itself plainly refers to the preceding text, which denounces the penalty of death on account of transgression: for the clause in the one, *lest he*

[1] Div. Leg. book ix. chap. 1. p. 255.

live for ever, manifestly corresponds with the clause in the other, *thou shalt surely die*[1]. Such being the case, the import of the one must be settled by the import of the other. But here lies the difficulty: and here it is, that his lordship's proof of his opinion seems altogether to fail. *Each* text is, in the abstract, ambiguous. Hence, let us take which of them we please for the basis of our proof, we can never decide the meaning of *the one* from the meaning of *the other*, until we have *first* established the meaning of that, which we assume as our basis: and, how this is to be effected, save by the aid of the circulating syllogism, I am unable to discover.

The matter, therefore, finally resolves itself to this. It is agreed on by all, both by the bishop and by those who differ from him, that the soul of Adam in his Paradisiacal state was *immortal*. Upon those consequently, who maintain that his soul *lost* its immortality by the fall, the burden of proof must certainly be imposed. We *know*, that it was *once* immortal: if it ever *ceased* to be immortal, let the demonstrative passage be produced. Until *that* be done, we can have no warrant for believing, that by the fall it became mortal no less than the body.

(5.) In fact, the bishop himself admits, that this supposed loss of immortality on the part of the soul of Adam is very far from being declared

[1] Comp. Gen. ii. 17. with iii. 22.

explicitly and distinctly by the sacred historian: but he would account for the circumstance by the aid of that position which forms the basis of his great work.

If it be asked, says he, *why Moses did not record this free gift of immortality, lost by the first Adam, in as open and clear terms as the second Adam proclaimed the recovery of it: I shall observe, that the several messengers of God's several revelations had each his proper office to discharge. It was the office of Jesus to bring life and immortality to light, or to promulge the doctrine of it in open day: it was the office of Moses to record the loss and to supply the want of it, in that dispensation which was committed to his charge*[1].

After so full an acknowledgment that the Hebrew lawgiver is by no means explicit on the subject, we may well pause ere we admit the very important position, that the soul of man became mortal in consequence of the fall. The bishop fairly owns, that Moses did not record the loss of immortality in clear and open terms: yet we are called upon to receive the doctrine on no better grounds, than the possibility of accounting for this obscurity by a dogma which *itself* is vehemently controverted by all his lordship's opponents. Moses, we are assured, was less explicit than he might have been, because it was not his office to promulge the doctrine of

[1] Div. Leg. book ix. chap. 1. p. 255, 256.

a future state of retribution; which yet he must have promulged, had he taught distinctly that immortality was lost by Adam and that it was recovered by the Messiah. Surely, before we can receive such a tenet, as that *the soul no less than the body became mortal by the fall,* we must have some much more satisfactory demonstration of its truth than that which has here been adduced.

(6.) Nor is this the only defective point in the argument of our mighty, though paradoxical, divine.

Man, we are told, lost his immortality by the fall: and he so lost it, that his soul became as subject to annihilation, as his body became subject to death. *By the penalty inflicted on Adam,* says the bishop, *he, with all his posterity, was again made mortal; that is, became* EXTINCT, *at the natural dissolution of the union between soul and body*[1].

Such, we are assured, was the penalty: and we are further assured, that it was *so* the office of Christ to bring life and immortality to light or to promulge the doctrine of a future state in open day, that nothing was left for Moses save to record the loss and to supply the want of it. This being the case, that is to say, if the penalty of EXTINCTION OF ANNIHILATION were inflicted upon Adam and upon all his posterity after him: we are naturally led to expect, that, from these

[1] Div. Leg. book ix. chap. 1. p. 266.

premises, Bishop Warburton will go on to teach us, that all men, who died before the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross, were wholly ANNIHILATED or (as his lordship expresses the matter) *became* EXTINCT. So we might expect: yet, after all, we find, that nothing of the sort did *really* take place. Though, *by the penalty inflicted on Adam, he, with all his posterity, was again made mortal or became* EXTINCT *at the natural dissolution of the union between soul and body:* still, so far as his soul was concerned, he was neither *made mortal* nor *became* EXTINCT; but, while his body suffered the punishment of death, his soul survived its separation and retained its immortality. The same fate attended all his posterity. Notwithstanding they likewise *became* EXTINCT; yet, in good truth, they were not ANNIHILATED. Their souls survived, and do still survive; though the penalty of the fall was utter EXTINCTION of being. *A secret* REPRIEVE, *kept hid indeed from the early world, passed along with the sentence of condemnation. For we learn from sacred Writ (what the principles of natural religion do not impeach), that the death of Christ had a retrospect from the fall of Adam; and that redemption was, from the first, among the principal ingredients in God's moral government of men*[1].

The retrospective efficacy of Christ's death we readily allow: but then we can allow it in

[1] Div. Leg. book ix. chap. 1. p. 268.

no other, than a *moral*, sense. If it operated (as it were) *physically* and therefore *universally*, the penalty, so far as the sense annexed to it by Bishop Warburton is concerned, was from the first a mere *brutum fulmen*: man was *threatened* indeed with the loss of immortality; but the threat neither *was*, nor was ever *meant* to be, put in execution. Yet, while Christ thus procured a remission of the penalty, he conferred, in reality, upon many millions, a curse rather than a blessing, an increase of punishment rather than an exemption from it. According to the theory of the learned prelate before us, had our Lord never interfered, the worst, that could have befallen the wicked, would have been mere annihilation, itself (in absolute strictness of speech) *no* punishment[1]: and, though the com-

[1] Many persons are accustomed to speak of annihilation, as if it were something peculiarly dreadful: whence they consider it as one of the most horrible punishments that could be inflicted. In some such light it seems to be viewed by Bishop Warburton: for he makes it to be eminently the penalty annexed to the primeval transgression of man. I must freely confess, that I never could discover the cogency of this opinion. As I can discern nothing dreadful in annihilation, so neither can I discern how annihilation can be *a punishment* in any legitimate sense of the word. A soul, through annihilation, is just as incapable of feeling either happiness or misery, as it was incapable of feeling either the one or the other previous to the commencement of its existence. Hence we may as reasonably say, that a soul was in a state of punishment before it began to exist, as that it is in a state of punishment after it has ceased to exist. Its very cessation of

paratively pious would have been subjected to the same fate; still, upon their extinction, they

existence renders it incapable of punishment. How then can annihilation be a punishment, when the subject of annihilation is made *ipso facto* incapable of feeling? If indeed the process of annihilation were attended with horrible pain, it doubtless would so far be a punishment. But then, in strictness of speech, the punishment would not be *annihilation itself:* the punishment would *really* be *that only which attended upon the process of annihilation.* The moment annihilation commenced, all punishment would cease: the annihilated being would have become a non-entity; and most plainly that, which exists not, can neither feel nor be punished. I can easily conceive, how some dreadful pain attendant upon the process of annihilation might be threatened and actually inflicted *as a punishment:* but I find it utterly impossible to frame any idea, how annihilation *itself* can be *a punishment,* when the annihilated soul has all the while, by the very terms of the proposition, ceased to exist. Hence, even if there were no other reason, I could never bring myself to believe with Bishop Warburton, that annihilation formed any part of the punishment of our first parents. To call annihilation *a punishment* seems to me a palpable contradiction in terms: and I cannot but think, that those, who so view it, labour under a very singular confusion of ideas. If I mistake not, they would set forth the matter in some such mode as the following. *The deprivation of a blessing once enjoyed is a punishment. But annihilation is the deprivation of a blessing once enjoyed. Therefore annihilation is a punishment.* This train of thought is so plausible, that many may well have been misled by it: but in truth it rests entirely upon the fallacy, which from beginning to end pervades the whole opinion. The deprivation of a blessing once enjoyed is doubtless a punishment, if the person so deprived be SENSIBLE of the deprivation: but, if he be INSENSIBLE of it, as in the case of his being annihilated, then

could have experienced no positive misery, because they would have ceased to exist altogether. But, in consequence of the penalty of annihilation being remitted through the meritorious sacrifice of Christ, while the condition of the pious indeed is very greatly improved, the condition of the wicked is immeasureably deteriorated. Instead of being benefactor of a very large portion of the human race, Christ has shewn himself to *them* a more bitter enemy than even the infernal serpent himself: for the severest punishment, which Satan brought upon them, was but *annihilation;* while the punishment, to which they are doomed through the restoration of their lost immortality in an evil hour procured for them by the Messiah, is *an eternity of positive woe.*

These are the results, which flow from the self-contradictory system of Bishop Warburton: but no such consequences proceed from the opposite system which teaches, that man did not lose his *spiritual* immortality by the fall, and

the deprivation is to him no punishment. What is it, that makes deprivation of eye-sight or of property a very severe punishment, when inflicted by a judicial sentence? Clearly the constant FEELING of the culprit, that he is blind or poor; and therefore his constant actual EXPERIENCE of the inconvenience of blindness or poverty. Annihilate him; and his punishment is forthwith brought to an end, because he no longer is capable of FEELING it. How then can annihilation, which puts an end to punishment, be *itself* a punishment?

that the retrospective efficacy of Christ's death is to be understood only in a *moral* sense.

According to *that* system, the penalty of the fall was the death of the body and the exclusion of the now polluted soul from the divine presence. Nor was this penalty a mere inefficacious thunderbolt, a mere threat never intended to be executed. A method of escape was indeed provided; and this method operated retrospectively, no less than prospectively. But then it did not operate *mechanically* and *universally*, so as to render the penalty from the very first altogether nugatory and unmeaning: nor did it so operate, as to *deteriorate* rather than *improve* the condition of the greater part, we may fear, of the human species[1]. On the contrary, its operation was purely *moral* and therefore strictly agreeable to every rational idea which we can form of a moral governor. The method in question found all mankind in Adam subjected to a heavy penalty. It proposed itself to them, as infallibly efficacious and sufficient: but it did not at once or universally rescind the penalty, which had been incurred. They, who, as moral agents, chose to avail themselves of it, became intitled to all its benefits: they, on the other hand, who, equally as moral agents, refused to avail themselves of it, remained in the identical condition in which it found them.

[1] See Matt. vii. 13, 14.

Here every thing is natural and orderly. Here we have no penalty rescinded mechanically and universally, as soon as it is imposed. Here we view not the Saviour of the world, exhibited under the unseemly and forbidding aspect of one, who, so far from improving, measurelessly deteriorates the condition of millions. Vast indeed and ineffable are the *benefits*, which he confers upon many by procuring for them a remission of the alone really dreadful part of the penalty: but none are *injured* by the beneficent Redeemer; for he brings not even the worst of men into a condition *more* dreadful, than that in which they had been *already* placed by rebellious transgression. As he finds them, so he leaves them: subject they previously were to the incurred penalty; and subject to it they still remain. But why do they so remain? Simply because God, as the moral governor of the universe, cannot, consistently with his fixed plan of moderating intellectual and accountable beings, operate upon their wills in any other way than through the medium of rational persuasion. We are told, that *the people of the Lord are willing in the day of his power*[1]: a golden sentence, which at once unfolds the mode of the divine administration, and for ever annihilates the stoical doctrine of *fatal necessity*. God might indeed, in the boundlessness of his power,

[1] Psalm cx. 3.

absolutely preclude mankind from the possibility of sinning: but how were they then probationary creatures, and how were their constrained and inevitable obedience pleasing in his sight? It is not thus, that the Deity operates upon the human soul. He addresses himself, by his good Spirit, to the intellect and to the affections. The reason is convinced by the arguments of divine wisdom, and the heart is won by the display of divine beneficence: then it is, that, by this strictly rational process, the people of Jehovah are made *willing;* then it is, that they begin to obey, not as slaves, but as sons. Yet, as we all know, the strongest arguments *may* be resisted, and the most disinterested beneficence *may* be churlishly spurned and rejected. If a man be so infatuated by sin, that he resolves at all hazards not to forsake it: then the original penalty remains in full force, and in God's own time will be inflicted to the uttermost.

These then are the two systems relative to the effects produced by the fall: whether of the two be most consonant with Scripture and with probability, let the cautious inquirer duly consider and soberly determine.

2. The next position, which the bishop undertakes to establish, is, that Adam and Eve, previous to their introduction into Paradise, were kept under the sole tutelage of natural religion, no revelation of God's will having as yet been made to them.

(1.) The first argument, which I shall notice as adduced to prove this point, is taken from the more and less confined grant of food set forth by the sacred historian.

At the creation of our first parents, God said: *Behold, I have given you* EVERY HERB *bearing seed, which is upon the face of the earth; and* EVERY TREE *in which is the seed of a tree, yielding seed:* TO YOU IT SHALL BE FOR MEAT.[1] But, when God put them into Paradise, he said: *Of every tree in the garden thou mayest freely eat; but of* THE TREE OF THE KNOWLEDGE OF GOOD AND EVIL, *thou shalt* NOT EAT OF IT.[2] Such is the varied language of Moses; in the one passage irrestrictive and general, in the other passage restrictive and particular; and from this variety of expression the bishop deduces his argument. *Hence it appears,* says he, *that Adam and Eve had a moral state, or were engaged to some religion, before their paradisiacal life commenced, and different from it: for, in the first, there was no restraint of food; in the second, there was. Whether the religion, to which they were first subject, was what we call* NATURAL, *as being the result and conclusion of that reason with which at our creation we were endowed; or whether it was that, which we call* REVEALED *or supernaturally taught by God: we can only learn from Scripture. And Scripture teacheth, even by its silence, that it was* NATURAL RELIGION *to which the first pair*

[1] Gen. i. 29. [2] Gen. ii. 16, 17.

were subject, from their creation to their entrance into Paradise[1].

This argument is certainly a very ingenious one: yet we may be allowed to doubt, whether it will constitute a foundation sufficiently strong for the support of the edifice which rests upon it.

The first chapter of Genesis contains a rapid, though regularly arranged, account of the creation: the second, either enlarges upon certain matters which had been hitherto but briefly specified, or adds certain important particulars which had been omitted in the general narrative. Thus we are told, in the general narrative, that every seed-bearing herb and every fruit-bearing tree was given as food to our first parents: but, in the explanatory supplement, we find, that this universal grant was not without an exception; for, as a test of obedience, the fruit of a single tree was prohibited. And thus we are told, in the general narrative, that both the man and the woman were created on the sixth day, without the least specified difference as to the mode of their creation: but from the explanatory supplement we learn, not only that the man was created before the woman; but likewise that the woman was formed out of the substance of the man, not out of the dust of the earth as man himself had been.

[1] Div. Leg. book ix. chap. 1. p. 244.

Now if Bishop Warburton be allowed to deduce an anteparadisiacal state of natural religion from the variation between the general and the particular account of the grant of vegetable food; I see not, how we can fairly deny to the Hebrew Rabbins an equal right to deduce their curious theory of a double creation of Eve from the discrepancy which exists between the general and the particular account of the mode in which the first pair were brought into being.

With respect to this latter point, the Rabbins argue very plausibly, after *their* manner, to the following purport.

Since, in one place, God is said to have created the human animal male and female; while, in another place, he is said to have taken woman out of man: it will follow, as the two accounts do not exactly tally, that the human animal must first have been created a compound hermaphrodite, Adam and Eve being joined together back to back or side to side; and that afterwards, by a second process, the woman was severed from the side of the man, the original word here employed really denoting *a side* and not *a rib* as it is expounded in the common English translation[1].

Such is the Rabbinical argument in favour o a double creation of Eve: and, so far as I can

[1] Origin of Pagan Idol. book v. chap. 4. § I. 3. p. 71, 72.

discern, it professedly rests on the very same basis as the argument of Bishop Warburton in favour of an anteparadisiacal state of natural religion.

The two accounts, say the Hebrew doctors, relative to the formation of the human species, do not exactly tally: therefore the second account must describe a formation *subsequent* to that, which is treated of in the first account. In a similar manner, the two accounts, says Bishop Warburton, relative to the grant of vegetable food, do not exactly tally: therefore the second account must describe a limited grant *subsequent* to that unlimited grant, which is treated of in the first.

The greatest of men will sometimes catch at a mere straw to save themselves from sinking. Who does not perceive, that, in the rapid history of the creation, a general grant of vegetable food, as contradistinguished from animal food, is made to the primeval race of men: and then afterwards, in an explanatory supplement, that this general grant, after the even proverbial manner of general rules, is stated to have a single exception.

(2.) Thus weak and inconclusive is the first argument, by which the learned prelate would establish the original subjection of Adam and Eve, in an anteparadisiacal state, to no system of religion save that which is called *natural:* nor

is his second argument more satisfactory than its predecessor.

Moses, in his supplementary account of the creation, remarks, that God made *every plant of the field before it was in the earth and every herb of the field before it grew: for the Lord God had not caused it to rain upon the earth*[1]. From this text the bishop very justly infers, that not vegetables themselves, but only their seeds, were originally created; whence he rightly states, that, *when the seeds of vegetables had been* thus *created on the third day, they were left to nature, in its ordinary operations, to mature by sun and showers*[2]. But

[1] Gen. ii. 5.

[2] Bishop Patrick, I am aware, understands the text differently; namely, not that the bare seeds of plants were the things created, but that the plants themselves were created before there was any seed to produce them and that God made them to spring up with their seed in them. This interpretation he would ground on the immediately consecutive passage: *For the Lord God had not caused it to rain on the earth, and there was not a man to till the ground.* Respecting which passage he observes: *Here are two reasons to confirm, that plants were not produced in the way they are now: for there had been no showers of rain, nor was there any man to prepare the earth to receive the seed (if there had been any); both which are necessary in the ordinary method of divine providence, ever since the world was made.* Comment. in loc.

After weighing the whole passage as carefully and attentively as I am able, it certainly appears to me, that Bishop Warburton's view of the matter is correct, and that the reasons adduced by Bishop Patrick in favour of his own opinion do in truth make decidedly against it.

we know, that many years must elapse, before trees attain even to a moderate size. Hence a

It doubtless might be said, that *God made every plant of the field before it was in the earth*, even if we adopt the interpretation of Bishop Patrick that each plant was created in a state of perfection previous to its being committed to the soil: but I see not, in accordance with the opinion of that learned prelate, how it could accurately be said, that *God made every herb of the field before it grew;* or rather, agreeably to the strict purport of the Hebrew צמח and the Greek ανατειλαι, *before it sprouted or germinated.* For, if this part of God's works were made BEFORE it sprouted or germinated, it must plainly, I should think, have been made in the form of seed: and, if the latter clause of the sentence must thus be necessarily understood, the former clause must, I should apprehend, be interpreted analogically. That is to say, plants and herbs were universally made, not in a perfect or fully germinated state, but in the form of seed anterior to such seed's sprouting or germinating.

It may be urged, that the general analogy of creation forbids the present supposition: for, if man and animals were originally made in a perfect or mature state, it is most natural to conclude that such also was the case with vegetables.

To this I reply, that there is no parallelism between the two matters, and therefore that no argument can be drawn from an imagined analogy. Unless man and animals had been made in a mature state, they must all of necessity have perished: for, the first man having no mother, and the first animals having no dams, they could not have been supported, save by the intervention of a prolonged miracle, had they been originally formed in an immature state. But no such need of a mature production exists in the case of the vegetable world. The seed of trees and herbs requires no parental care and attention. Let it only be committed to the ground; and, in due time, it springs up without any further trouble. Hence there existed a necessity for the mature creation of man and

considerable period of time must have evolved, ere the garden of Paradise, which he supposes to have been planted on the third day when the whole vegetable family was created, could be fit for the reception of Adam and Eve. The human species, however, was created on the sixth day; or only three days after the seeds of the vegetable family had been created. Therefore the garden of Paradise, having been planted on the third day, could not have so grown up from seed in the short space of three days as to be fit for their reception on the sixth day. Such being the case, it was only, *when, in course of time, Paradise was become capable of accommodating its inhabitants,* that *they were transplanted thither.* Consequently, says the bishop, *how* LONG, *before this remove, man had continued subject to natural religion alone, we can only guess. But of this we may be assured, that it was some considerable*

animals, while no similar necessity existed for the mature creation of vegetables.

After all, I am no way *particularly* bound to defend the opinion of Bishop Warburton on this point. Nothing, advocated by *myself,* depends upon it: and, if it be untenable, the argument, which *he* has built upon it, falls to the ground without any labour of confutation. But, believing him to be right in his view of the matter, I have judged it most fair and most honourable to argue the question on the acknowledgment, that *vegetables were first created in the form of seed previous to sprouting or germination.* Even according to this acknowledgment, his argument will prove to be invalid and inconclusive.

time before the garden of Eden could naturally be made fit for his reception.[1] Now that considerable indefinite portion of time his lordship allots for the anteparadisiacal state of our first parents under the tutelage of natural religion[1]. His proposed arrangement, in short, of the whole matter is, as follows. Adam and Eve were first placed upon the earth at large, which they were commanded to replenish: during this period, while they were subject to natural religion only, the garden, which had been planted on the third day when the seeds of the whole vegetable family were created, continued slowly growing agreeably to the ordinary rate of the increase of trees: and, when at length it was fit for their reception, and when God had sufficiently tried and approved of their conduct while in a state of nature, they were advanced to a superior state of revealed religion in Paradise[2].

Nothing can be more ingenious than the present argument, but nothing can be more insubstantial. It is wholly built upon the gratuitous assumption, that the six days of the creation were six natural days or six of those brief periods which are measured by the revolution of our planet round its axis: and, what is still more unfortunate, it is inconsistent with the Mosaical narrative, even if this assumption be admitted as valid.

[1] Div. Leg. book ix. chap. 1. p. 254.
[2] Div. Leg. book ix. chap. 1. p. 243, 254.

The bishop very rightly determines, from the language of the sacred historian, that vegetables were created, not in a mature state, but in the form of their respective seeds. Now the whole vegetable family was thus created on the third day; while the birds of the air were created on the fifth day, and the beasts of the earth with man himself on the sixth day. This being the case, how, on the scheme of Bishop Warburton, are we to find provisions for the whole race of graminivorous and seminivorous and fructivorous animals; within which man must be included, since at the beginning he was not carnivorous? It is plain, that, if the seeds only of vegetables were originally created, and if those seeds germinating into herbs and trees were left to nature in its ordinary operations to mature by sun and showers; both birds and beasts and man, which were not carnivorous, must have perished with hunger: because beings created on the fifth and sixth days must have been famished, ere seeds created on the third day could have arrived, in the ordinary course of nature, at productive maturity. We must therefore either miraculously hasten their growth; on which supposition, Paradise will be quite ready for Adam as soon as he is created: or we must confine it to the ordinary course of nature; on which supposition, man, with all land-animals not carnivorous, will perish through want of necessary food.

Thus untenable is the theory of Bishop Warburton, even if we admit his assumption, that the six days of the creation were only six natural days: but, if that assumption can itself be proved untenable, then of course his theory will be deprived of its only even plausible support; because, should the six days of the creation turn out to be each a period of very considerable length, it is manifest, that whether Paradise was planted on the third day or at a subsequent time, it will have had quite a sufficient space to come to maturity ere the creation of its destined tenants the first human couple. Now, that the six days of the creation were each a period of very considerable length, may be proved, partly by analogy of language, partly by the very necessity of the narrative, partly by ancient tradition, and partly (and that most decisively) by the discoveries of modern physiologists. The full consideration, however, of this very curious subject will occupy so much space, that, omitting it for the present, I shall resume it hereafter; an arrangement, which will prevent the inconvenience of an otherwise too great interruption of the topic now more immediately under discussion[1].

3. One very important point yet remains to be examined. Ere the bishop attempted to

[1] See below, book i. chap. 3.

prove the existence of Adam and Eve in an anteparadisiacal state of natural religion, he ought to have firmly established the existence of this anteparadisiacal state itself.

That *Adam* was first created and afterwards placed in the garden, is readily allowed: but it is not equally clear, that such also was the case with *Eve*. Now, in order to obtain an anteparadisiacal state of existence for the original human *pair*, it is plainly incumbent upon the bishop to shew, that *Eve*, no less than *Adam*, was created *out of* the garden and afterwards placed *in* the garden: for, unless this can be done, it is clear, that, whatever space of time may have elapsed between the creation of *Adam* and his introduction into Paradise, *Eve* can never have existed in *any* anteparadisiacal state.

To the system then of Bishop Warburton, which places our first parents under the tutelage of natural religion, during a period of indefinite length, ere they are introduced into Paradise; it is imperiously necessary, that *Eve*, as well as *Adam*, should have been created *out of* the garden and *previous* to her introduction *into* the garden.

The argument, so far as I can understand it, by which the bishop would procure an anteparadisiacal state for Eve, is to the following effect.

Eve was created on the sixth day, no less than

Adam[1]. Now Adam could not have been created *in* the garden; because he is said to have been placed in it *subsequent* to his creation[2]. But Eve was created *synchronically* with Adam, each having been alike created on the sixth day. Therefore Eve, having been created *synchronically* with Adam, like him could not have been created *in* the garden, but like him must have been placed in it *subsequent* to her creation[3].

The fallacy of this argument, when thrown (as I have thrown it) into a regular syllogistic form, is easily detected.

Adam, no doubt, was created on the sixth day. Eve also, no doubt, was created on the same sixth day; and therefore, so far, was created *synchronically* with Adam. Adam moreover could not have been created *in* the garden; because he is expressly said to have been placed in it *subsequent* to his creation. All this is quite clear: but, how it thence follows, that Eve could not have been created *in* the garden, I am unable to discover. Adam and Eve were doubtless both created on the sixth day: but this affords no proof, that Eve, like Adam, could not have been created *in* the garden. For why are we bound to suppose, that the creation of Eve followed the creation of Adam *quite instan-*

[1] Gen. i. 27, 28. [2] Gen. ii. 8.
[3] Div. Leg. book ix. chap. 1. p. 236.

taneously and *without any even the smallest interval*; a point, dexterously, though tacitly, assumed by the bishop? We are equally at liberty to suppose, that, although both were created on the sixth day, a certain interval elapsed between the creation of the one and the creation of the other, and that this interval was occupied by the introduction of Adam *alone* into Paradise. In such a case, the order of events will be, as follows. First, Adam will have been created, in the course of the sixth demiurgic day: next, in the course of the same sixth day, he will have been placed in the garden: and, lastly, still in the course of the same sixth day, Eve will have been created *from* his side and *in* the garden.

Here then we have *two* suppositions; either of which, in the abstract, will accord with the declaration, that the first pair or both Adam and Eve were created on the sixth day: the one exhibits Eve, as having been created *out of* Paradise and *anterior* to her introduction into it; the other exhibits her, as having been created *in* Paradise and therefore as *never having existed* in an anteparadisiacal state. *Which* of these two suppositions is the true one, can only, I presume, be determined by the authority of Scripture.

Now the second supposition, not that which is required by the theory of Bishop Warburton, is very fully established in the sequel of the inspired narrative: and, consequently, the an-

teparadisiacal state of Eve, under the tutelage of natural religion, vanishes into empty air. For Moses, unless we exhibit him as writing in a most vague and desultory manner, declares, that Eve, though created like Adam on the sixth day, was yet created AFTER the introduction of Adam into Paradise, and therefore was herself created IN Paradise. Hence the system of the bishop and the narrative of Moses are palpably inconsistent. The sacred historian, in the supplement to his cosmogony, FIRST mentions the introduction of Adam into Paradise: and, AFTER Adam has been thus introduced, he NEXT details the special mode in which Eve was created. Therefore, unless with Bishop Warburton we make him gratuitously depart from regular chronological order, Moses certainly declares, that Eve was created IN the garden AFTER Adam had been introduced into it. Accordingly, in this manner, as the bishop himself allows, the inspired historian has always been understood both by Jews and by Christians: nor, in truth, is it possible to understand him in any other manner, unless we are determined to sacrifice consistency for the sake of establishing a purely gratuitous theory.

In short (to sum up the whole matter), if we adopt the theory of Bishop Warburton, we shall be compelled to ascribe to Moses a total want of order and method in the composition of the supplement to his cosmogony. In this supple-

ment, the historian mentions the introduction of Adam into Paradise, BEFORE he details the special mode in which Eve was created: whence the natural and obvious conclusion is, that Eve was created SUBSEQUENT to the introduction of Adam into Paradise; and therefore, as having been formed out of his side, that she was created IN Paradise. Yet, according to the bishop, we must view the creation of Eve, which doubtless took place on the sixth day, as LONG PRECEDING Adam's introduction into the garden. Hence, if his lordship's opinion be well founded, the question immediately presents itself: Why did Moses thus gratuitously depart from regular chronological order? He might have placed his account of the creation of Eve, just as well BEFORE the introduction of Adam into Paradise, as AFTER it; if such, as Bishop Warburton contends, were *really* the succession of the events. Why then did he place his account of Eve's creation, AFTER the introduction of Adam into Paradise, instead of BEFORE it? Why, in his narrative, did he precisely invert the natural order of circumstances[1]? No good writer, even putting inspiration out of the question, will mar his composition with *unnecessary* perplexity. Had Moses meant what the bishop asserts him

[1] If the bishop be right in his view of the matter, the natural and regular position of the passage, comprehended in Gen. ii. 21—25, would have been immediately after ver. 7; not surely, where it stands at present, after ver. 20.

to have meant, he would not, I think, have expressed himself in such a manner, as to lead every person before the time of the learned prelate, whether Jew or Christian, into a complete misapprehension of his meaning: for, as his lordship allows, and as I have already stated, the sacred historian has been universally understood, both by Jews and by Christians, to intimate that Eve was created IN the garden SUBSEQUENT to Adam's introduction into the garden.

4. Before this part of the subject be entirely dismissed, I shall attempt to determine the true chronological arrangement of the planting of the holy garden: a point of some moment, because Bishop Warburton (so far as I can judge) has not only erred in direct opposition to the plain narrative of Moses, but has also made his error the basis of an argument which I have already taken occasion to discuss[1].

The bishop supposes, that the garden was planted on the third day of the creation: and the reason of his supposition is, that the third day is devoted to the production of the whole family of vegetables.

Now, with respect to this opinion, it quadrates, neither with *the obvious purport of the history of the third day's work*, nor with *the natural plan of the entire narrative.*

(1.) *The work of the third day* was the creation

[1] See above book i. chap. 2. § I. 2. (2.)

of all vegetable seeds: and, during its ample period, the face of the globe was repeatedly overspread by the successive generations of trees and plants and herbs and grasses[1]. But God is specially said, to have planted a garden in Eden, and to have made it an epitomè of the whole vegetable world by causing every tree pleasant to the sight and good for food to grow out of the ground[2].

Here, I think, we have plainly two very distinct operations: the general creation of seeds; and the particular subsequent planting of the garden with the seeds, which had been already created. Under this obvious view of the subject then, there is not only no necessity to ascribe the planting of Paradise to the third day; but, from the vast length of each creative day, we have abundant reason to conclude that it did not take place until a much later period. Planted no doubt the garden must have been in the course of the six days; both because the Lord rested from all his work on the seventh day, and because it must have been planted *before* the creation of man which was the *last* work of the sixth day: but we have no reason to suppose, that it was planted until it was about to be necessary; in other words, we have no reason to suppose, that it was planted until a short time before the creation of man, a time

[1] See below book i. chap. 3. [2] Gen. ii. 8, 9.

however sufficiently long to allow it to arrive at maturity ere its destined tenant was created.

(2.) This rational supposition will make the planting of the garden a work of the sixth day; intermediate, between the creation of beasts and reptiles on the one hand, and the creation of man on the other hand: and, with it, *the obvious tenor of the Mosaical narrative* will perfectly agree; while, with Bishop Warburton's supposition, it will by no means satisfactorily accord.

The whole history of the creation comprizes the space of six days or periods: and the cosmogony itself, as the Jewish Rabbins very rightly place the division, and as we most assuredly ought to have made the first chapter of Genesis terminate, reaches to the end of the third verse of our present second chapter.

Here closes the general history of the creation: and this general history comprizes the creation of every thing; for nothing was created after the expiration of the sixth period. But, agreeably to the usage of all good writers, Moses found it expedient to comment and enlarge upon certain parts of his general and brief history. This produced a supplement, which is comprized in all the remainder of our present second chapter.

The supplement itself is divided into two parts.

In the first of the two parts, we are taught,

that vegetables, unlike animals, were created, not in a state of maturity, but in the condition of seed: and we are further instructed, how the process of vegetation was carried on anterior to the fall of rain[1].

In the second of the two parts, we have an account of the planting of the garden and the creation of the human pair[2].

Now these two matters, *the planting of the garden*, and *the creation of the human pair*, are so intermingled and connected with each other, that it is impossible to separate them: whence, unless we ascribe a most extraordinary degree of perplexity to the sacred historian, we must conclude, that they *both* took place in the course of the sixth period; that is to say, we must conclude, that the second part of the supplement details more at large the events, which occurred towards the close of the sixth period, and which specially relate to the creation of our own species.

Moses begins with stating, that God formed man from the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; a statement, which constitutes an important addition to what had been previously said on the same subject[3]. He then goes on to tell us, how the Lord had provided for the reception of his creature man,

[1] Gen. ii. 4—6. [2] Gen. ii. 7—25.

[3] Gen. ii. 7.

by planting a garden in Eden; a matter, which in his general history he had left altogether unnoticed[1]. From his account of the garden, he returns to its destined inhabitant, whose creation he had previously fixed to the close of the sixth period or the sixth great day. Man, immediately after the commencement of his existence, is brought into Paradise now quite ready for his accommodation[2]. Here, the sole exception to the universal grant of vegetable food is distinctly stated to him: and the penalty, which would follow his disobedience, is authoritatively enounced[3]. Next, the Lord remarks, that it was not good for man to be alone; for an intellectual being could have no interchange of ideas with the brutes: whence he declares his purpose of making a help meet for him[4]. But, previous to this operation, it was necessary that man should possess a more extensive knowledge of language, than was sufficient to enable him to understand the mere prohibition of a certain fruit-tree: for, without such knowledge, he could have no communication with his associate, even had she been then in existence. Hence, the Lord is introduced in the act of teaching man language, as a master would teach a child. The several animals are successively brought before him: Adam is sti-

[1] Gen. ii. 8—14.
[2] Gen. ii. 8, 15.
[3] Gen. ii. 16, 17.
[4] Gen. ii. 18.

mulated to use his powers of articulation: his memory is preternaturally strengthened, so that the recollection of words is with *him* no slow and gradual process: and thus, whatsoever names he imposes upon his bestial subjects, those names become henceforth their appropriate and distinctive appellations. When language was thus far advanced, its further improvement and amplification seem to have been left to human industry; which would easily work forward, analogically to the clue which it had already received: for, when man had once learned, with what certainty and facility he might point out each animal by a name which would immediately excite the idea of it, even though the animal itself were not present; he would readily extend his nomenclature to every other sensible object, and then from the objects themselves he would proceed to invent words indicative of their various operations or sufferings. In all this, as I have just observed, we may be sure that his memory would be divinely assisted: and thus, scanty and imperfect as language might be at the first, he would be prepared for the grateful task of becoming the instructor of his consort, as soon as she should be presented to him by their common Creator[1]. At length, still on the *sixth* day, for Moses as-

[1] Gen. ii. 19, 20. See Div. Leg. book ix, chap. 1. p. 244, 245.

sures us that both the male and the female of the human species were alike created on that day, God proceeds to fulfil his promise, that he would make for man an help meet for him. Adam is thrown into a deep sleep: and, while he remains in that state, some part of his side is taken out; and, from this portion of his animal frame, the Lord models the first created woman [1].

From this plain narrative nothing can be more clear, than that Eve was formed *in* Paradise, *subsequent* to the introduction of Adam into the garden, and *subsequent* to his learning the rudiments of language by his being directed to bestow upon each animal its proper appellation. But it is equally clear, that *she*, no less than *Adam*, was created on the sixth day [2]. Hence it will follow, that Adam must have been placed in Paradise before the expiration of the sixth day, that Eve could not have existed prior to the planting of the garden, and that the garden itself must have been planted shortly before the creation of man in order that it might be ready for his reception as soon as he should have been created [3].

[1] Gen. ii. 21—25. [2] Gen. i. 26—28.

[3] See Gen. ii. 15. *And the Lord God took the man, and put him into the garden of Eden, to dress it and to keep it.* The obvious drift of this passage is, that the man was placed in the garden for the purpose of cultivating it, as soon as the garden itself was ready for his reception.

Thus we finally learn, that the supposed anteparadisiacal state of our first parents under the law of natural religion could never have had any actual existence.

II. The *anteparadisiacal* state of natural religion having now altogether vanished from our sight, let us try, whether we shall have any better fortune in discovering that *second* state of natural religion, in which the primeval pair (according to Bishop Warburton) were *again* placed after the fall, and in which the whole human race continued until the promulgation of the Law by Moses.

Of this inquiry, no part, either past or future, is to be viewed in the light of a mere play of intellect; the bishop maintaining, and myself opposing, certain tenets which are matters rather of curiosity than of importance. Such, be it duly observed, is very far from being the case. As I have already stated, and as I here again state, lest this grand point should be overlooked; if the bishop be in the right, the Patriarchal Dispensation is a mere chimera: for, if the period, which we have been accustomed to allot to the Patriarchal Dispensation, was occupied by nought save natural religion; it is abundantly manifest, that, the Patriarchal Dispensation itself could never have existed. Hence, the inquiry becomes an investigation of high importance, and appears under an aspect

directly opposite to that of mere barren curiosity.

Natural religion, unless I wholly misapprehend the term, denotes *that religion, which man might frame to himself by the naked exercise of his intellectual powers, if he were placed in the world by his Creator without any communication being made to him relative to that Creator's will and attributes.* In absolute strictness of definition, we ought further to say, *without any knowledge of the very existence of God beyond what might be collected by the use of reason:* but, since we are compelled to depart from this strictness in viewing that *second* state of natural religion, which Bishop Warburton ascribes to our first parents and their posterity subsequent to the fall (for Adam, when he entered upon it, must have already known, *from the very demonstration of his senses*, that there *was* a God); we must content ourselves, in prosecuting this inquiry, with the less perfect definition which was previously laid down. For myself, I utterly disbelieve the existence of *natural religion* in any proper sense of the term; for I can discover no warrant for asserting, that God placed his creature man in the world, and then left him to ascertain his moral duty as best he might[1]: but, if we are to understand *any*

[1] I am perfectly aware, that St. Paul speaks of *the Gentiles doing* BY NATURE *the things contained in the Law.* Rom. ii. 14. But this cannot be deemed any proof of the existence of natural religion in the *legitimate* sense of the

thing by the term itself, we must plainly view NATURAL *religion* as a law contradistinguished

phrase. No doubt, when *men do not* LIKE TO RETAIN *God in their knowledge*, as the same apostle speaks, God may, in righteous judgment, *give them over to a reprobate mind:* and thus, among their posterity all certain knowledge of primeval revelation may be extinguished. Rom. i. 28. But this is a very different case from that, supposed by the bishop, and set forth by the *legitimate* use of the phrase *natural religion*. It was not, that the Gentiles *never had* the light of revelation; but that they *departed* from it, through pure dislike of its restraints: they once knew God; but they did not like to RETAIN him in their knowledge. Hence, when St. Paul speaks of *the Gentiles doing* BY NATURE *the things contained in the Law;* his words can afford no proof of that *aboriginal* existence of natural religion, for which Bishop Warburton contends. The later Gentiles might indeed have sunk into a condition, which was equivalent to natural religion; and might thence have had no better theological directory, than their own reason: but this, as the whole tenor of the apostle's argument shews, was *a state of degeneracy*, not *a state in which they were placed by God himself immediately after the fall*. With the same confusion of ideas, we often find *a state of savage brutality* denominated *a state of nature*; and into this palpable error no one falls more repeatedly and pertinaciously than Bishop Warburton himself. Whereas, in truth, *man's* REAL *state of nature*, both theological and political, is *a state of revealed religion and of well-ordered society*. This was the state, in which he was ORIGINALLY placed and therefore his REAL state of nature. Hence, if ever we find him in a condition of savage brutality or of total ignorance of revealed religion; we do not find him in a state of nature, but in a state of degeneracy. It is lamentable to see such a man as Bishop Warburton, quoting the legends of Paganism, to prove the savage state a state of

from REVEALED *religion;* so that, as REVEALED *religion* is *the special communication of the Deity,* thus NATURAL *religion* is *the sole product of rational investigation.* Such, accordingly, is the aspect, under which the bishop sets forth both the one and the other. With him, NATURAL *religion* is *the result and conclusion of that reason, with which, at our creation, we were endowed:* and, with him also, REVEALED *religion* is *religion supernaturally taught by God,* which *we* of the present day *can* of course *only learn from Scripture* [1].

All, that we can *know* respecting man's condition after the fall, must be learned from the Bible: yet we may gather some gleanings from pagan tradition, which, though no way decisive of the question, may nevertheless, to a certain extent, be not altogether without their proper value.

1. To the Bible however we must look for any *positive* determination of the matter: with the Bible therefore our inquiries must obviously commence.

If then we find, that, when the threatened sentence of death had been passed upon the unhappy offenders, God withdrew himself from

nature from which we have but gradually at length emerged; when Scripture so plainly and so rationally asserts the priority of a well-ordered state of society. But of this more hereafter.

[1] Div. Leg. book ix. chap. 1. p. 244.

all further intercourse with man, and that nothing was revealed from heaven until the time of Moses; Bishop Warburton's opinion will in that case no doubt be firmly established: at least it will be established to the full extent of the definition, which has already been given of natural religion; for, whatever might be the state of Adam *after* the fall, it is clear, that, what had *previously* been revealed to him, could not, through his transgression, have *ceased* to be revealed to him. Unless a miracle of oblivion had been wrought upon him, unless he had been made to drink of the waters of a real Lethè, he could not *unlearn* that revealed knowledge which had been *communicated* to him in his Paradisiacal condition. Hence, even *in limine*, except by a very restricted definition of the term, it was physically impossible for our first parents to have been brought into a state of purely natural religion. Let this however pass: and let us freely concede, that if Scripture be silent as to any communications from God to man *after* the fall, the human race were certainly placed in that condition of natural religion, for which (when the necessary limitations of the term have been made) Bishop Warburton contends.

But, on the contrary, if we find some important matters, highly suitable to man in his corrupt state, revealed to him from heaven *subsequent* to the fall: I see not then, how it is possible for this great writer's theory to be tenable. For

what, according to his own definition, is *natural religion?* He tells us very justly, that it is *the result and conclusion of that reason, with which, at our creation, we were endowed*[1]. If then mankind, during the patriarchal ages, were on any points *supernaturally taught by God;* which is the bishop's no less just account of *revealed religion*[2]: it is clear, that the religion, under which they were placed, was not *natural,* but *revealed.* The revelation might be more, or less, extensive and complete: but this is nothing to the purpose in hand. If God, during the patriarchal ages, communicated to man, what he could not have known *without* such communication; or if he authoritatively enjoined certain duties, the fitness and even the obligation of which might possibly have been discovered by the unassisted light of reason: then it is difficult to comprehend the propriety of asserting, that, when *man was driven out of Paradise,* he was *sent back again to his former state, the subject of* NATURAL *religion;* a state of subjection, in which *he continued until the giving of the Law*[3].

One might almost imagine from the apparent incautiousness of this assertion, that the learned prelate had incuriously passed over more than one remarkable passage which has been carefully recorded by Moses. Yet this is very far

[1] Div. Leg. book ix. chap. 1. p. 244. [2] Ibid.
[3] Div. Leg. book ix. chap. 1. p. 255.

from being the case: the bishop made the assertion with all these passages standing arrayed in full front before him: and the mode, in which he anticipates the sufficiently natural objection, certainly shews his ingenuity in splitting a hair; whatever degree of conviction it may work upon the mind of a plain reader.

Man, says his lordship, *having forfeited the free gift of immortality, is driven out of Paradise, and returned back to the state and condition in which he was created, a subject only of* NATURAL RELIGION. *But, when we speak of the two religions,* NATURAL *and* REVEALED, *we must distinguish (in our use of the term* REVELATION), *between* A SYSTEM *of revealed religion, and* AN OCCASIONAL COMMUNICATION *of the divine will to man for his conduct on particular points or for his comfort in general, when the course of God's moral government required that he should, from time to time, have intimations given to him, more or less obscurely, of the hidden purpose of Providence in his favour; and this, through various Dispensations, till, at the final completion of them, life and immortality should be again brought to light and restored. These* OCCASIONAL COMMUNICATIONS *began with that contained in the sentence, denounced on the serpent or the evil one, that the seed of the woman should bruise his head, and that he should bruise its heel: and ended with that given by the mouth of Jacob, that the sceptre should not depart from Judah nor the lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh should come, to whom*

the gathering of the people should be. What followed these OCCASIONAL COMMUNICATIONS *was that* SECOND SYSTEM *of revealed religion, delivered to the posterity of Abraham by Moses, preparatory to the* THIRD *and last under the reign or rule of Shiloh or Jesus Christ, which took in and embraced the whole posterity of Adam. So that, of revelations, in the sense of* REVEALED SYSTEMS *of religion, there were but* THREE: *the* FIRST, *given to Adam when placed in Paradise; the* SECOND, *given to the posterity of Abraham when going (under the ministry of Moses) to possess the promised land; and the* THIRD, *promulged to all mankind by Jesus the Messiah*[1].

The mode then, in which Bishop Warburton would meet a very natural objection to his theory, is this.

We must carefully distinguish between *a* REGULAR SYSTEM *of revealed religion* and *mere* OCCASIONAL COMMUNICATIONS *of the divine will.* To Adam in Paradise, to the Israelites under Moses, and to all mankind through the ministry of Christ, *a* REGULAR SYSTEM *of revealed religion* was delivered: therefore all these have successively been the subjects of REVEALED RELIGION. But to Adam and his posterity, from the time of the fall down to the promulgation of the Law, *mere* OCCASIONAL COMMUNICATIONS *of the divine will* were made: therefore Adam and his poste-

[1] Div. Leg. book ix. chap. 1. p. 264, 265.

rity, from the fall down to the promulgation of the Law, were the subjects of NATURAL RELIGION.

Such is the defence projected by this eminent prelate: a defence, so strangely weak and unsatisfactory, that we are almost tempted to disbelieve the evidence of our very eye-sight, while we read it in the concluding book of his elaborate work.

Granting for a moment the validity of that distinction, which he would draw between A REGULAR SYSTEM and AN OCCASIONAL COMMUNICATION; we are obviously led forthwith to ask, what was that REGULAR SYSTEM delivered to Adam in Paradise before the fall? We readily perceive, that the Levitical and the Christian Dispensations were each A REGULAR SYSTEM. But the whole of that Paradisiacal Dispensation, for which the bishop contends as the FIRST of the THREE REGULAR SYSTEMS, is comprized in a single sentence: *Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat; but, of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it, for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die*[1]. His Lordship himself acknowledges, that we have here that entire Dispensation; which he would decorate with the name of A REGULAR SYSTEM, and which he would pronounce homogeneous with the two later SYSTEMS of the Law

[1] Gen. ii. 16, 17.

and the Gospel: nor is it possible indeed to avoid such an acknowledgment; for, let us prosecute our researches so long as we please, we still shall find not any more copious materials out of which we may build up the bishop's FIRST REGULAR SYSTEM of revealed religion[1].

(1.) And now let us turn to the earliest of what he maintains to be nothing more than OCCASIONAL COMMUNICATIONS; a communication however, which was the germ of almost every succeeding communication during the patriarchal ages. We shall find it couched in the following prophetic sentence pronounced upon the serpent.

I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed: he shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel[2].

The passage, which under penalty of death forbids Adam to eat of the tree of knowledge, may be esteemed *about equal*, in point of length, to this present passage; which, as the bishop justly remarks, sets forth the blessing of redemption[3]. But let us observe the different measure, which he metes out to them. We are required to view the former as so ample and comprehensive, that its copiousness may well vindicate to the Paradisiacal Dispensation the

[1] Div. Leg. book ix. chap. 1. p. 254, 255.
[2] Gen. iii. 15.
[3] Div. Leg. book vi. sect. 3. p. 386, 387.

character of being the FIRST of the only THREE REGULAR SYSTEMS which have ever been delivered to mankind: while we are exhorted to pronounce the latter so meagre and scanty, that its penury forbids us to concede to it any higher praise than that of being AN OCCASIONAL COMMUNICATION of the divine will. Nor is this the whole, which is demanded of us. The former of the two passages, constituting as it does A REGULAR SYSTEM of revealed religion, compels us, according to the bishop, to pronounce Adam a subject of REVEALED RELIGION while he was as yet upright in Paradise: but the latter of the two passages, being nothing more than AN OCCASIONAL COMMUNICATION of the divine will, requires us, if we may believe his lordship, to pronounce Adam a subject only of NATURAL RELIGION after he had fallen from his original integrity. Hence the sum and substance of the whole matter will be this. Adam, *before* the fall, was a subject of REVEALED RELIGION; because he was placed under the controul of a positive precept, altogether foreign to the religion of nature: but the same Adam, *after* the fall, was a subject only of NATURAL RELIGION; because he was assured, that, in the fulness of time, he should be redeemed from the power of his infernal enemy by some mighty Deliverer who should be the seed of the woman.

I am aware of what the bishop's reply to this objection would be: it stands ready prepared

in another part of his work. While he observes very truly, that the sentence pronounced upon the serpent contains a prophecy of *our redemption through Jesus Christ;* he denies, that its import, so far as the point of *redemption* is concerned, was understood by the ancient Jews and therefore much less by their still more ancient predecessors.

This very important question will be discussed hereafter in its proper place[1]: at present therefore I shall content myself with observing, that even that imperfect comprehension of the prophecy, which his lordship concedes to those who lived before its accomplishment, is wholly inconsistent with his avowed opinion that Adam and his posterity after the fall became the subjects of natural religion.

Speaking of the passage before us, *It will be allowed,* says he, *that even the most early mortals could not be so stupid as modern infidels would make them, to understand these words in their strict literal sense, that serpents would be apt to bite men by the heel, and men as ready to crush their heads. But, to enable them to understand by this part of the sentence, that man should be restored to his lost inheritance of immortality by the sacrifice of Christ on the cross, needed an express revelation of this mystery. What then did the Jews understand by it? This certainly, and nothing but this: that the evil*

[1] See below book i. chap. 5, 6.

spirit, who actuated the serpent, would continue his enmity to the human race; but that man, by the divine assistance, should be at length enabled to defeat all his machinations[1].

Now, if sufficient were revealed to Adam immediately after the fall to enable both himself and his posterity to understand, that, although their infernal enemy might in the first instance have been successful, yet *man, by the divine assistance, should be at length enabled to defeat all his machinations:* if, I say, the earliest prophecy, as the bishop himself allows, *might* or rather *must* have been interpreted to such an extent as this; I see not, how mankind, during the patriarchal ages, can with any propriety be described as the subjects of mere NATURAL RELIGION. For what was it, circumstanced as they then were, which they specially needed to learn from a divine revelation? *The certain knowledge of a God* they had already: and, as *the great outlines of moral duty* must have been taught to Adam while in his Paradisiacal state of revealed religion, we may be sure that he would authoritatively communicate them to his descendants; for, even if he *had* been degraded to a state of natural religion after the fall, this degradation could not, without a miracle, have made him unlearn what he had previously learned in his Paradisiacal state of revealed religion. What

[1] Div. Leg. book vi. sect. 3. p. 386, 387.

knowledge then was there left for man to acquire, essentially necessary to his fallen condition and yet incapable of being taught by natural religion, beyond that identical knowledge which Bishop Warburton himself supposes him to have acquired from the first delivered prophecy? Since he had suffered loss through the temptation of the serpent, the grand point, which *he* had to learn, was plainly this: *whether his loss might, or might not, be ever repaired.* Now, the bishop himself being judge, this point, which he could never have learned from natural religion, he *did* learn from the earliest prophecy: for he must have learned from it, as his lordship fully admits, *that the evil spirit, who actuated the serpent, would continue his enmity to the human race; but that man, by the divine assistance, should be at length enabled to defeat all his machinations.* If then he learned such a lesson from the prophecy; he learned most undoubtedly, that his loss would be repaired: for he could not have learned, *that, by the divine assistance, he should be at length enabled to defeat all the machinations of the tempter;* if the tempter were, nevertheless, suffered to remain victorious by the complete success of that first and palmary machination, which procured the forfeiture of man's immortality.

As for *the precise mode* in which Adam's loss was to be repaired, it was no way necessary to its final reparation that *that* should be commu-

nicated to the earliest race of mortals: if they simply knew, that, by the divine assistance, it at length *would* be repaired; they knew all that was *absolutely necessary* to be known, in order to their preservation from that total despair which is the characteristic of irreversibly condemned spirits. Knowing this, they knew the Gospel in epitomè: for, to such knowledge, even the full light of the Gospel adds nothing more, than a knowledge of *the precise mode in which* and of *the precise person by whom* the loss of Adam was destined to be repaired. Hence, if they understood the first prophecy as the bishop says they *must* have understood it (for he justly remarks, *that even the most early mortals could not be so stupid as modern infidels would make them):* they lived, quite as much as ourselves, under a Dispensation *strictly evangelical.* For the character of *evangelical* has regard to *the kind,* not to *the degree,* of knowledge: and, if they had learned, *that man, by the divine assistance, should be at length enabled to defeat all the machinations of his infernal enemy;* it was no way necessary to their sense of comfort and security and reconciliation with a justly offended God, that they should be further taught *the precise mode in which* and *the precise person by whom* all the machinations of the serpent should be at length defeated. Even in such a state of comparative darkness, they would not have been ignorant of the grand essential of the Gospel; for they would have been made

acquainted with that precise matter, which confers upon the Gospel its leading characteristic of being *a message of glad tidings to ruined man.* Consequently, if *the matter itself* were imparted to them, with whatever *degree* of light or obscurity, at the exact time when there first was need that it *should* be imparted: they certainly, possessing as they must then have possessed *the very substance* of the Gospel, cannot have been *sent back again* (as the bishop expresses it) to their former imaginary state of natural religion. On the contrary, as a well grounded hope would still remain at the bottom of the casket, and as that hope would be specially built on an express revelation from heaven: they most evidently must, after the fall, have been the subjects not of *natural* religion but of *revealed;* even according to his lordship's own very accurate definition of the term, as a religion *supernaturally taught by God*[1].

Thus would the truth shine out with unextinguishable lustre, even if the first prophecy had been the sole revelation communicated to the early race of mortals: for, when once it was known that *the loss of Adam was destined to be repaired,* nothing could be added to this primary revelation of A FACT, except certain subordinate particulars respecting THE MODE and THE TIME and THE PLACE and THE PERSON. With

[1] Div. Leg. book ix. chap. 1. p. 244.

regard to THE FACT itself, it was incapable, AS A BARE FACT, of receiving any augmentation. Adam and his early posterity, even with that degree of light which the bishop allows them to have derived from the prophecy, knew, that *the loss was destined to be repaired:* and *we ourselves,* in the full blaze of evangelical illumination, much as our knowledge of *adjunctive particulars* may have been increased, are in reality not a whit better acquainted with THE NAKED LEADING FACT OF A REPARATION OF THE LOSS, than *they* were. But the first prophecy was by no means the sole revelation communicated to the early race of mortals: it was followed by a succession of other revelations throughout that whole period, which the bishop would allot to the dominance of mere natural religion. This indeed he acknowledges: but then, to save his theory, he tells us, that they were only OCCASIONAL COMMUNICATIONS *of the divine will to man;* and, as such, must not be confounded with A SYSTEM *of revealed religion.* On the same principle, he might just as well denominate every revelation to the Israelites, posterior to the promulgation of the Law from mount Sinai, AN OCCASIONAL COMMUNICATION *of the divine will;* and might thence deny to *the series of those communications* the character of A SYSTEM. For where is the perceptible difference between the two cases? The various predictions of the later bards, *relative to the Messiah,* have exactly

the same connection with that of Moses, *relative to the great prophet who was to succeed him;* as the several predictions of Noah, *relative to God's dwelling in the tabernacles of Shem,* of the Lord himself *relative to all the families of the earth being blessed in the seed of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob,* and of Jacob *relative to the sceptre and the law-giver,* have with the original prediction *respecting the Seed of the woman.* If then all the prophecies on this subject, which were delivered from Moses to Christ, are to be viewed, not as OCCASIONAL COMMUNICATIONS, but as jointly constituting the parts of A REGULAR SYSTEM of revealed religion: it is hard to say, why a directly opposite character ought to be given of all the prophecies on the very same subject, which were delivered from Adam to Moses. Nor are these the only points of similitude between the Levitical Dispensation and what we have been accustomed to denominate the Patriarchal Dispensation. Under the Levitical Dispensation, various prophecies were delivered, to which the name of OCCASIONAL COMMUNICATIONS may not improperly be applied; such, for instance, as *threats of speedy punishment to be inflicted upon the impenitent:* and, in like manner, before the promulgation of the Law, more than one prophecy was delivered, to which I can readily apply the same title of OCCASIONAL COMMUNICATIONS; such, for instance, as *the prophecy of Enoch recorded as genuine by the in-*

spired authority of St. Jude, and *the prophecy of Noah to an irreclaimable world that an universal deluge was about to take place.* If then, under the Law, these OCCASIONAL COMMUNICATIONS are to be viewed, as in some sort belonging to one harmonious SYSTEM of revealed religion: why is the same character to be denied to those other OCCASIONAL COMMUNICATIONS of the divine will, which were made before the Law.

(2.) Let us however trace the history of man through that entire period, during which the bishop would turn him over to the sole guidance of natural religion.

Immediately after his fall, a remarkable prophecy is delivered in his presence; which, as the bishop truly remarks, he could not be so stupid as to understand in a mere literal sense. From this prophecy, according even to the lowest degree of light which it could communicate to him, he must have learned; that, by the divine assistance, his loss was destined to be repaired, while the power of his infernal enemy was to be completely annihilated.

Next, during our imaginary period of natural religion, we find the Lord himself interposing, after a very remarkable manner, at the dissimilar sacrifices of Cain and Abel. An offering of vegetables is rejected: an offering of an animal victim is accepted. Whatever may be the reason of this difference, while Cain is told that he himself shall be accepted (apparently with-

out the need of *any* sacrifice), provided he can claim the praise of doing well: he is further told, that, if he be conscious of *not* doing well, which doubtless every man after the fall *must* be; a sin-offering or an animal-victim, as the accompanying verb plainly requires us to understand the original Hebrew, *coucheth* at the door of the tent ready for him to make expiation withal. Now, if we allow to the uttermost all the improbabilities which Bishop Warburton has written on the topic of sacrifice, we clearly could not learn from natural religion, that a bloody offering was *more* acceptable to God than a bloodless one. Natural religion, if it taught us any thing on the subject, would teach us the very reverse; unless indeed it taught us to view the Deity as delighting in carnage and slaughter. It is quite unsatisfactory to say, that the different aspect, with which God regarded the two sacrifices, may be accounted for by the different tempers of the two sacrificers. Were this the true solution of the problem, Cain would have been simply enjoined to correct his evil temper; and would have been told, that, when that was done, his *vegetable* oblation would be no less readily accepted than the *animal* oblation of his now more righteous brother. But, instead of taking any such course, God, we see, informs him, that, in his capacity of a sinner, he must himself bring an *animal* oblation as well as Abel; thus strongly teaching us, that, for some reason

or another, the Lord prefers an *animal* to a *vegetable* oblation. The reason of this preference is obvious enough, and it stands immediately connected with the revelation concerning the future seed of the woman: but my sole business at present is to point out *the preference itself;* because a declaration of *such preference* on the part of God, amounting as it does to *a positive ordinance* (even if we concede that no *prior* ordinance had been made), is clearly incompatible with every idea which we can form relative to a state of mere natural religion.

After the interposition of God at the sacrifices of Cain and Abel, the next remarkable occurrence is the preaching of Enoch, as recorded by St. Jude. It will not be disputed, that he was a faithful servant of God sent to warn a highly corrupt and degenerate race, whatever might be the precise tenor of his ministration. But neither such a commission, nor his final rapture to heaven, can be thought to accord very harmoniously with the unassisted religion of nature.

The same remark applies to the labours of Noah, which were continued during the space of more than a century. He wrought indeed unsuccessfully in a barren field, as Enoch had done before him: but still I see not, how his efforts, in the professed capacity of an inspired servant of Jehovah, can be reconciled with the idea, that both he and his contemporaries were all the while subjects only of natural religion.

After the deluge, the same face of things continues to present itself. Shall we say, that the whole family of Noah were ignorant of all religion, save that (to adopt the language of Bishop Warburton) which *we call* NATURAL, *as being the result and conclusion of that reason with which at our creation we were endowed*[1]? If so, how does such an opinion accord with God's revelations to Noah? Did he learn from natural religion, that the world was about to be inundated by a deluge; that the rainbow was a sign, that no future deluge should occur; that animal food was now become lawful, whereas before it was unlawful; that the descendants of Canaan should be servants to their brethren; that Japhet should be enlarged in the persons of his posterity; and that God would dwell, after some undefined manner, in the tents of Shem?

As little can we place the next generation or generations in that comfortless predicament, to which the bishop would consign the whole human race before the promulgation of the Law. What the parents knew, the children must also have known: and, without contending for those seven precepts of Noah which the Rabbins ascribe to him, it is difficult to conceive, how those, who knew all which the patriarch knew, could yet have no religion save what they argu-

[1] Div. Leg. book ix. chap. 1. p. 244.

mentatively deduced from the light of nature. The patriarchal religion was indeed soon corrupted into a specious system of demonolatry: but this very system when analysed, will prove to have been built upon the foundation of revealed theology. Its basis was the doctrine of *redemption by vicarious sacrifice* and of *the recovery of lost holiness and immortality*. Had it been preceded by an absolute state of natural religion, *itself* could never have sprung into existence[1]. Meanwhile did God withdraw himself from the concerns of men, that so they might uninterruptedly enjoy the result and conclusion of their own reason? Nothing of the sort. He first interfered to disturb the ambitious projects of the architect of Babel; and next he miraculously called forth Abraham from among the fire-worshippers of Chaldèa, lest he too should be swallowed up by the increasing torrent of corruption. Was Abraham then a subject of natural religion? If this were the case, how shall we account for his frequent intercourse with the Almighty; and above all for his having beheld from afar, with the enlightened eye of faith, the predetermined day of the yet future Deliverer? It were useless to prosecute the investigation any further. The case of Abraham's descendants down to the time of Moses is but, in fact, the case of Abraham himself.

[1] See below book i. chap. 6.

May it not then now be fairly asked, where have we once discovered the features of natural religion throughout the whole period which Bishop Warburton marks out for its special domination? I suspect indeed, that we presently *shall* discover it: but, when discovered, this philosophical syslem will turn out to be neither more nor less than a rank apostasy from the revealed religion of Patriarchism[1]. The *proper* religion however of the early ages, by which I mean *the religion appointed for man after the fall*, was assuredly, if we may credit the Mosaical account of the matter, A SYSTEM OF REVEALED RELIGION.

(3.) But the bishop is very unwilling to allow the name of A SYSTEM to what he deems mere OCCASIONAL COMMUNICATIONS, in any such sense as the Law and the Gospel are each confessedly A SYSTEM.

We have seen, that the title cannot justly be withheld from Patriarchism on *this* account: because, in reality, THE SYSTEM of Judaism and of Christianity is likewise THE SYSTEM of Patriarchism; the three Dispensations differing from each other only in the different degrees of copiousness, with which they severally enounce the subordinate particulars of MODE and TIME and PLACE and PERSON attached to one and the same PALMARY FACT. The only remaining

[1] See below book i. chap. 7. § II. 2.

ground therefore, on which the name of A SYSTEM can justly be denied to the patriarchal religion, is its want of an outward regular form or ritual.

On this point we do not know much: but we know enough, I think, to shew, that any such ground would be untenable.

Those *sons of God*, mentioned by the sacred historian, seem pretty evidently to have constituted the antediluvian hierarchy; which, on the patriarchal maxim of primogeniture, and agreeably to the old Hebrew tradition, would be composed of the children of Seth[1]. Nor did this priesthood want a fixed place for their ministration. We read, that Cherubim were *placed* before the eastern gate of Paradise: but we read not, that they were *subsequently removed* at any time previous to the deluge[2]. We further read, that Cain and Abel *brought* their offerings to the Lord, and that from the place whither they *brought* them they afterwards *went out* into the field: but we read not, that they offered up their sacrifices in *any* spot, which might haply present itself to them, or which they might select at pleasure[3]. If then we may be allowed to argue analogically from the use of the Che-

[1] Gen. vi. 4. See below book i. chap. 7. § II. 2. (3.) (7.)

[2] Gen. iii. 24. See Horæ Mosaic. book ii. sect. i. chap. 1. § VII. 1. (7.) See also below book i. chap. 7. § II. 2. (3.) III. 2. (2.)

[3] Gen. iv. 3, 4, 8. in Samar. and Greek.

rubim under the Law to the use of the Cherubim during the patriarchal ages, we may reasonably infer: that the sanctuary, where Jehovah was worshipped, was before those Cherubim; that to this consecrated spot the two brethren brought their sacrifices, not *in process of time* (as our common translation reads), but *after the end of days* or *on a periodically stated festival*[1]; that from this same consecrated adytum they afterwards went out into the field, where the murder was committed; and that there also *the sons of God*, or *the sacerdotal children of Seth*, ministered in holy things before the Lord, from the devolving of the primogeniture upon their ancestor down to the very epoch of the deluge[2]. Agreeably to such an opinion, we find, that the sacrificial distinction of animals into clean and unclean was by no means peculiar to the Levitical Dispensation. It certainly subsisted in the days of Noah: and, as it *then* subsisted, we have every reason to believe, that it *had* subsisted even from the first institution of sacrifice[3]. The same remark applies to the due observance of the sabbath. We know, that the sanctification of the seventh day was a positive ordinance, which commenced with the divine sabbath: and

[1] On the proper import of this phrase, see Kennicott's Two Dissert. dissert. ii. p. 177—183.

[2] See below book i. chap. 7. § II. 2. (3.)

[3] Gen. vii. 2. See Horæ Mosaic. book ii. sect. i. chap. 1. § VII. 1. (2.)

we likewise know from the history of the deluge, that a special regard was had to the seventh day by the patriarch Noah[1]. Hence we may be morally certain, that this sacred season of rest was duly observed by the pious throughout the whole period which elapsed between the creation and the flood.

Thus, so far as we can learn from Scripture, instead of man being sent back to a state of mere natural religion after the fall of Adam; he was forthwith placed under a system of revealed religion alike regular and well ordered, whether we consider its internal structure and purpose or its external frame and institutions.

2. The evidence of pagan tradition is exactly to the same purpose: and, though alone it would be plainly insufficient to establish the fact contended for; yet, as an auxiliary handmaid to Holy Scripture, it may very fitly and very cogently be here adduced.

To enter at large upon so wide a topic is altogether beside my present design: I shall content myself with stating, that the ancient legends of the Gentiles, in whatever part of the globe we meet with them, recognize nothing like that imaginary religion of nature, which is made by Bishop Warburton to supplant the Patriarchal Dispensation. According to these relics, some

[1] Gen. viii. 10, 12. See Horæ Mosaic. book ii. sect, 1. chap. 1. § VII. 1. (4.)

of which are amazingly vivid and distinct, the gods in the early ages familiarly mixed and conversed with mortals. Religion herself was not earth-born, but descended from heaven. Nay, so little was excogitated by mere unassisted nature; that, if we may believe the old pagan traditions, the use of sacrifice, the construction of the sacred edifices, and the grand outlines of the whole mysterious ceremonial, were all taught and enjoined by the gods themselves[1].

III. Bishop Warburton however, not satisfied with dooming man after the fall to the palpable darkness of natural religion, withholds from him all hope and expectation of any future state. In the counsels of God indeed there was a tacit reprieve from the sentence of annihilation, which, it is contended, was pronounced upon our first parents: but this reprieve was a mystery concealed from the whole human race, until Christ brought life and immortality to light by the Gospel.

How then, under such unpromising circumstances, did the affairs of the world roll on? If men were subjected to natural religion without the least hope or knowledge of a future retributive state, and if at the same time they lived (as we ourselves confessedly do at present) under a plainly unequal Providence; they could have had no adequate motive to regard either religion

[1] See Origin of Pagan Idol. particularly book v. chap. 6, 7.

or morals: with respect to the former, they must soon have sunk into rank atheism; with respect to the latter, they must soon have wallowed unrestrainedly in the puddle of gross sensuality, or have entirely disregarded with systematic selfishness those social bonds which link man to man. For, if the comparatively pious prospered no more in this world than the determinately impious, and if the hope of both alike perished in the grave: there were no inducement to regard either religion or morals, beyond the social benefits, which, to a certain extent, might be observed to flow from them. But we all know, that so feeble a motive as this would be only like tow in the furnace, when placed in competition with the selfish and violent passions of fallen man. Hence, if the human race, down to the promulgation of the Law, were subjected to natural religion without the least hope or knowledge of a future retributive state, and if at the same time they lived like ourselves under the dispensation of an unequal Providence: it is plain, in the very way of cause and effect, that the world, previous to the time of Moses, must have exhibited one continued scene of atheism and profligacy and complete political anarchy. In what manner then, under such circumstances, was this necessary evil to be avoided?

According to Bishop Warburton, *that distribution of reward and punishment, which God, under*

every mode of his moral government, makes with supreme justice, either here in this world, or hereafter in another, was (when the sentence of DEATH *was denounced on man's transgression) at first* MADE HERE IN THIS WORLD, *so long as he continued to be favoured with the administration of* AN EQUAL OR EXTRAORDINARY PROVIDENCE: *which, as we learn from the Mosaic history, continued from the fall down to the time when polytheism universally prevailed*[1]. Now we find no traces of polytheism *before* the deluge: and we may be morally sure, that in the new world it did not commence until some time *after* that catastrophè. The bishop therefore, when farther evolving the subject, mentions the extermination of the Canaanites by the avenging sword of Israel as the last instance of this extraordinary providential administration[2]. Thus it appears, that, in the judgment of his lordship, mankind lived under an equal or extraordinary Providence, from the fall down to the entrance of Israel into Palestine.

I have already observed, how necessary the establishment of this point is to the general theory of Bishop Warburton: hence he certainly does well to deduce it, not only from principles which themselves would probably be controverted, but from the positive declara-

[1] Div. Leg. book ix. chap. 1. p. 266.
[2] Ibid. Notes. p. 377.

tion of Scripture also. *An equal or extraordinary Providence*, says his lordship, AS WE LEARN FROM THE MOSAIC HISTORY, *continued from the fall down to the time when Polytheism universally prevailed.* Do we inquire into the specific NATURE of this equal or extraordinary Providence, which supplied to the patriarchal ages the want of a future retributive state? The bishop informs us, that it was strictly analogous to the NATURE of that equal or extraordinary Providence, to which the Israelites were subjected under their miraculous theocracy down to the time of the Babylonian captivity. *As soon as God had selected a chosen race*, continues his lordship, *and had separated it from the rest of mankind to place his name there; we see with astonishment this equal Providence* REVIVE *in Judèa: for man was still under the curse or doom of death*[1]. The equal Providence then of the Hebrew theocracy was no other, than the equal Providence of the patriarchal ages REVIVED: consequently, as the term REVIVE plainly imports, the two were, in the judgment of the bishop, *identical.* Now the equal Providence of the Hebrew theocracy, as the bishop most justly remarks, was administered, partly over the state in general, and partly over private men in particular[2]. In the

[1] Div. Leg. book ix. chap. 1. p. 266.
[2] Ibid. book v. sect. 4. p. 134, 135.

former case, national obedience was uniformly attended with national prosperity and triumph, while national disobedience was uniformly attended with national adversity and defeat: in the latter case, individual obedience met with an unfailing temporal reward, while individual disobedience was sure to draw down meet punishment upon the offender even in this present world. Such is the account of the matter, which is given by Moses in his Institutes: and this precise account the bishop avowedly makes the basis of his famous argument, to prove the divine legation of the Hebrew lawgiver from his omission of a future retributive state. But the equal Providence of the Israelitish theocracy was A REVIVAL of the equal Providence of the patriarchal ages. Therefore the NATURE of the latter was *identical* with what we are taught to esteem the NATURE of the former: and the assured EXISTENCE of the latter, if the learned prelate be right in his assertion, WE LEARN FROM THE MOSAIC HISTORY. Here then the matter is brought to a simple question of fact: and, of course, our only business is to consult the history, which Bishop Warburton claims for his voucher.

Where then is the proof, that any such equal or extraordinary Providence subsisted during the patriarchal ages, as that which Moses so unequivocally declares should subsist during the

period of the Hebrew theocracy? Find we any traces of it in that history, to which the bishop refers us?

His lordship thinks, that we do: but the only instances, which he adduces, are the destruction of the old world by the deluge, the subversion of Sodom and Gomorrha by fire from heaven, and the extermination of the Canaanites by the sword of Israel[1]. To these we may add the sentence pronounced upon Cain, and the miraculous interruption experienced by the architects of Babel; and we shall then, I believe, have the sum total of recorded scriptural examples. Such is the scanty evidence, which the bishop has or might have produced by way of establishing the very important assertion, that mankind during the patriarchal ages lived under an equal or extraordinary Providence similar to that which so eminently characterised the Hebrew theocracy.

1. Now this evidence is plainly far *too weak a foundation* to support the lofty superstructure which is reared upon it, even if we refrain from objecting to the peculiarity of its *nature*.

According to the bishop, mankind needed something to supply the want of a retributive future state viewed as a religious sanction: and this *something* he determines, *professedly on the authority of Scripture*, to be an equal or extra-

[1] Div. Leg. book ix. notes. p. 377.

ordinary Providence. Yet, when we descend to facts, we have not a single instance upon record of the exertion of any such Providence during the whole sixteen centuries, which intervened between the sentence of Cain and the eruption of the deluge. With respect to these two instances, the latter would of necessity be quite useless in a moral point of view to those who lived *before* its occurrence: for the children of Adam, in the lines of Cain and Seth and those other sons who are said to have been born to him, certainly could not argue, that vice would infallibly be punished in this world and that virtue would infallibly be rewarded on this side of the grave, from an event which had not as yet taken place. Hence it will follow, that, so far as we have any *scriptural* authority for making the assertion, a punishment to be inflicted upon Cain here, which was the former of the two instances, was that solitary exertion of an extraordinary and equal Providence, which might serve, during sixteen centuries, to convince the antediluvians of the certainty and justice of God's moral government. In *such* a school of virtue, it were small wonder, that they studied with so little emolument.

2. But the evidence adduced by the bishop, is not only penurious in its *quantity:* it is likewise unsatisfactory in its *nature.*

The equal and extraordinary Providence of the Hebrew theocracy was but, we are told, A

REVIVAL of the equal and extraordinary Providence of the patriarchal ages. Hence the latter, like the former, must have extended, partly *over states in general*, and partly *over private men in particular*: for such is the very accurate account, which his lordship gives of the specific NATURE of the former. Now it is abundantly plain, that the instances, adduced by the bishop to prove the equal and extraordinary Providence of the patriarchal ages, have no affinity with the specific NATURE of that equal and extraordinary Providence which characterised the Hebrew theocracy. To prove his point satisfactorily, he ought, I conceive, to have shewn, FROM THE EXPRESS DECLARATIONS OF THE MOSAIC HISTORY; that, during the patriarchal ages, virtuous states and virtuous individuals were uniformly victorious and prosperous, while vicious states and vicious individuals were uniformly depressed and degraded and unhappy and unsuccessful. Had the bishop done *this*, the debate would indeed have been speedily brought to a close: but the adduction of a few occasional and perfectly insulated penal miracles can never be admitted as a scriptural proof, that the men of the patriarchal ages lived under an equal and extraordinary Providence SIMILAR to that which so eminently marked the Hebrew theocracy.

3. It may be said, that the extreme brevity of

the early Mosaic history forbids us to expect an ample and copious demonstration.

Should such an argument be adduced by any stout Warburtonian, the proof FROM SCRIPTURE is at once given up: and, if the point cannot be proved FROM SCRIPTURE, it never can be proved by reasoning forward from principles which themselves are liable to be controverted. But, in truth, brief as may be the early history of Moses; it contains quite enough to overturn the singular opinion, which our great prelate, evidently in order to give due rotundity to his grand system, has incautiously been led to hazard.

Had nothing more been recorded than the case of Cain and Abel, it alone were abundantly sufficient for our present purpose.

The eminent piety of Abel procured to him, from the lips of essential truth, the appellation of *righteous*[1]: the character of the envious and malignant fratricide Cain requires no comment. Now, according to the bishop's hypothesis, what was the retribution IN THIS WORLD, which was severally awarded to the two brothers, on the principle of their being alike subjected to an equal or extraordinary Providence? The blood-polluted Cain was indeed punished by being doomed to a nomade state of life: but we find

[1] Mark xiii. 35.

him, building a city, and becoming the father of a flourishing family, and apparently enjoying to an advanced old age a considerable portion of worldly happiness[1]. On the contrary, the righteous Abel was cut off by the hand of violence in the midst of his days: every earthly enjoyment was prematurely brought to an end: and he left no son to convey his name and remembrance to posterity. Here then, even at the very commencement of that administration of an equal Providence for which Bishop Warburton contends, we have as strong a proof of marked inequality as can well be desired: for, notwithstanding the sentence pronounced upon Cain, we find, that, on the whole, the lot of a wicked man was far more prosperous and desireable than the lot of a good man.

Should it be said in reply, that the piety of Abel was abundantly recompensed hereafter: this, no doubt, is perfectly true; but then it bears not at all upon the *present* question.

We have not to consider the *real* final destination of that righteous man, but the moral influence which his untimely fate must have had upon a race wholly ignorant (if we may believe the bishop) of a future state of retribution. *They* of course, by the very terms of the theory, would not view the murdered saint, as enjoying eternal happiness in heaven: so far from it,

[1] Gen. iv. 17.

they would believe him to be wholly annihilated. Hence, under *their* aspect of the matter, an impious murderer would inevitably appear to have a much fairer portion allotted to him, than an eminently righteous man who had perished by his hand. Need I formally point out the obvious result? Instead of God's justice evidencing itself *in this world*, by the administration of an equal or extraordinary Providence, which should supply to the early race of mortals their alleged want of knowledge respecting a *future* state of retribution: they would behold a professed and favoured servant of Jehovah faring much worse, than a wretch who had imbrued his hands in the blood of an unoffending brother. Most plainly and logically therefore would they conclude, that there was no profit in serving the Lord: most rationally, under *their* circumstances of total ignorance respecting an hereafter, would they act upon the principles of the apophthegm; *Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die.*

In short, so far from our being able to discover any vestiges of an equal or extraordinary Providence operating throughout the patriarchal ages, the very first recorded incident after the fall proves to demonstration that no such Providence was ever exerted.

CHAPTER III.

RESPECTING THE LENGTH OF THE SIX DEMIURGIC DAYS, IN THE COURSE OF WHICH GOD IS SAID TO HAVE FASHIONED THE MATERIAL WORLD OUT OF CHAOS.

THE second argument of Bishop Warburton, by which he would prove the subjection of our first parents to natural religion in an anteparadisiacal state, rested, as we have seen, upon the gratuitous assumption, that the six days, in the course of which God is said to have fashioned the material world out of Chaos, were six natural days or six of those brief periods which are measured by the revolution of our planet round its axis[1].

Now, so far from allowing the propriety of this assumption, I will venture altogether to deny it: for, that the six demiurgic days, instead of being nothing more than six natural solar days, were each a period of very considerable length, may be proved, partly by *analogy of language*, partly by *the very necessity of the*

[1] See above book i. chap. 2. § I. 2. (2.)

narrative, partly by *ancient tradition,* and partly (and that most decisively) by *the discoveries or possibly the re-discoveries of modern physiologists.*

I. With respect to the analogy of language, we are told, that the Lord fashioned the world in six days, and that he rested on the seventh day.

Here the analogy of language requires us to understand these days homogeneously: that is to say, if one of the seven mundane days be a natural day, they must all be natural days; and conversely, if one of the seven mundane days be a period of great length, they must all be periods of great length.

Perhaps I need scarcely remark, that in Scripture nothing can well be more indefinite than the term, which we translate by the English word *day.* Sometimes it denotes *a single revolution of the earth round its axis:* sometimes it denotes *a revolution of the earth round the sun* or what we call *a natural year*[1]: sometimes it denotes *a whole millenary*[2]: sometimes it denotes *a period of probably great, but of wholly undetermined length*[3]: and sometimes it denotes *all the six demiurgic days collectively;* that is to say, *all the six demiurgic days viewed as jointly forming a*

[1] Numb. xiv. 34. Ezek. iv. 6. Dan. xii. 11, 12. Rev. xi. 3, 9. xii. 6.

[2] Psalm xc. 4. 2 Peter iii. 8.

[3] Isaiah ii. 12. xiii. 6. Joel i. 15. Zeph. i. 7, 8, 18. Mal. iv. 5. 1 Thess. v. 2. 2 Peter iii. 10.

single demiurgic day or period[1]. Thus, in truth, the term *abstractedly* would be more accurately expressed by the English word *period* than by the English word *day:* for the context alone can determine, what *specific* period it may describe in any particular passage; though doubtless, in common speech, it is ordinarily employed to set forth *a natural day* or *a revolution of the earth round its axis.*

The question therefore is, what specific period it describes in the Mosaical history of the creation.

Now this question, as I have already observed, will be determined, according to the analogy of language, if we can in some degree ascertain the length of any one of the seven demiurgic days: for, just as we understand *one* of these days, so must we understand them all.

Let us take then, as our test or gage, the seventh day or the divine sabbath. Was this sabbatical day a single revolution of our planet round its axis: or are we to deem it a period of very considerable length?

On the mind of a cursory reader, the first impression, I have no doubt, would be, that the divine sabbath was a single natural day: yet, if we dwell upon the subject a little more attentively, we shall find it no easy matter to establish the consistency of such an opinion.

[1] Gen. ii. 4.

If God laboured six natural days and rested on the seventh natural day, the very turn of the statement will unavoidably imply, that he resumed his labours on the eighth natural day or on the first day of the following natural week: just as in the case of the human commemorative sabbath, when man is commanded to labour six natural days and to rest on the seventh natural day, the very turn of the command implies, that his rest is to terminate with the seventh day and that his labour is to recommence with the eighth.

But was this the plan adopted by the Supreme Being? Did he resume his labours on the eighth natural morning? Most certainly he did not: for we are assured, that *the heavens and the earth and all the host of them* (a comprehensive phrase plainly expressive of the WHOLE material world) *were* FINISHED at the close of the sixth day, that *on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made,* and that *from all his work which he had made he rested on the seventh day*[1].

If then God did not resume his creative labours on the eighth natural morning, his sabbath or rest certainly extended *beyond* the limits of the seventh natural day: and, if it extended *beyond* the limits of the seventh natural day, a single natural day most undoubtedly could not be the measure of the divine sabbath.

[1] Gen. ii. 1, 2, 3.

But at what time did the divine sabbath, thus plainly extending beyond the limits of the seventh natural day, terminate? In good truth, its termination has not even yet arrived: for the creative labours of God have never been resumed. The vast machine of the Universe was completed at the close of the sixth day: and, since that time, the distinctive character of the Almighty has been, not to create, but to govern and to preserve. As the ancient philosophers of Hindostan have rightly understood, and have well expressed, the matter; *He, whose powers are incomprehensible, having created the Universe, was again absorbed in the Supreme Spirit, changing the time of energy for the time of repose*[1]. The time of God's energy was doubtless the period of the creation: the time of his repose is doubtless the period, during which he has ceased from his creative labours. But the time of his repose from the work of creation has not yet expired. Therefore the divine sabbath has not yet terminated. Its termination, in fact, so far from having arrived at the close of the seventh natural day, will not arrive until the predicted dissolution of the present order of things. *The day of the Lord*, says the apostle St. Peter, *will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat; the earth also*

[1] Instit. of Menu. chap. i. § 51.

and the works that are therein shall be burned up. Nevertheless, we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness[1]. When the world, which we now behold, shall have passed away; and when God shall create the promised new heavens and new earth (in whatever precise sense these remarkable expressions ought to be understood), as he formerly created the present heavens and the present earth[2]: then will the Lord resume his long-intermitted demiurgic labours; then will the divine sabbath terminate; then, in the phraseology of the Brahmenical sages, *will he, whose powers are incomprehensible, change the time of repose for the time of energy.*

Thus it appears, that the divine sabbath, instead of being limited to a single natural day, is in truth a period commensurate with the duration of the created Universe. What that duration will be, no one knows save the Father only[3]: but this we know, that according to the Hebrew chronology the world has already existed nearly six thousand years, and that according to the Samaritan chronology it has existed longer than six thousand years. The divine sabbath therefore is a period of not *less* duration than six millenaries. But the analogy of language requires us to interpret homogene-

[1] 2 Peter iii. 10, 13.

[2] Compare Gen. ii. 1, 4. with 2 Peter iii. 13.

[3] Matt. xxiv. 36.

ously the seven days, which constitute the great week of God. Hence, as the seventh day is a period of not *less* duration than six millenaries, each of the six days must similarly and proportionately have been equivalent to a period equalling or exceeding six thousand years.

Of this great week our minor week is a commemorative epitomè. Our six days of labour correspond to the six periods of God's labour: and our sabbatical day shadows out the sabbatical period, during which the Almighty has *rested from all his work which he had made.*

II. We shall be brought to a parallel result by the very necessity of the Mosaical narrative, a point in some measure touched upon already.

We are told, that *God created every plant of the field before it was in the earth and every herb of the field before it grew*[1]: whence, as Bishop Warburton justly observes, we are obliged to conclude, that God created the whole vegetable family, not in a state of maturity, but in the condition of seed previous to germination[2]. Now the whole vegetable family was created on the third day; birds of every description were created on the fifth day; and beasts and reptiles and man were created on the sixth day. Such being the case, it is clear, on the supposition of the six demiurgic days being six natural days,

[1] Gen. ii. 5.

[2] See above book i. chap. 2. § I. 2. (2.)

that, without a miracle, all graminivorous and seminivorous and fructivorous animals must have perished through hunger: because on such a supposition, the vegetable seeds, which were created and committed to the earth on the third day, could not, in the ordinary course of germination, have produced a sufficiency of food for non-carnivorous animals created on the fifth and sixth days in time to save them from destruction by famine.

To solve this difficulty, we have our choice of two expedients. Either a miracle of germination must have been wrought; through which the vegetable seeds sprang up almost instantaneously and quite out of the common course of nature, to complete and productive maturity: or the six days of creation must each have been a period greatly exceeding the length of a single revolution of the earth round its axis.

Here then we must make our choice: for, in no way, save by the one or the other of these two expedients, can the non-carnivorous animals be preserved from certain destruction. Now we know, that God works not superfluous miracles. Therefore, agreeably to the established principles both of his moral and his physical government, we are bound, I think, to conclude, that each demiurgic day was a period greatly exceeding the length of a natural day.

III. With this conclusion the tenor of ancient tradition exactly corresponds.

1. In the sacred volume of Hindoo law, which, from evidence partly extrinsic and partly intrinsic, its eminently learned translator pronounces to be one of the oldest compositions existing, we find a day and a night of the Creator extended to such a length as almost to baffle computation: and, with this stupendous length, we further find, that his demiurgic labour and repose are immediately connected. During his day of energy, he creates the world: *his night* of repose *endures as long as his day:* and, *at the close of his night, having long reposed, he awakes; and, awaking, exerts intellect, whose property it is to exist unperceived by sense. Intellect, called into action by his will to create worlds, performs again the work of creation:* for *numberless are the creations and destructions of worlds. The Being supremely exalted performs all this, as if in sport, again and again*[1].

2. Similar in principle was the doctrine of the ancient Persians and Etruscans; the latter of whom, according to Herodotus, were a Lydian colony from Asia Minor[2].

Moses tells us, that God formed the world in six days, or rather in six periods of whatever length; for our definite English word *day* but

[1] Instit. of Menu. chap. i. § 64—80.

[2] Herod. Hist. lib. i. § 94.

imperfectly expresses the sense of the indefinite original Hebrew word.

Such was the primeval account: and it had evidently been received by those two ancient nations, though they modified it on the very same principle of extension for which I am contending. According to the Persians, the world was formed in the course of six different periods; each period comprehending a considerable number of days, and the sum total of the six amounting to a year: but whether a literal or a mystical year, it is left undetermined[1]. In a similar manner, according to the Etruscans, the world was formed in the course of six periods; each period comprehending a millenary: while six thousand years are allotted for a seventh period, namely, that of its duration[2].

These ancient cabalas are adduced, certainly not by way of any direct proof, but simply by way of shewing that the system of expanding the six demiurgic days into six ample periods is no merely modern speculation.

IV. The discoveries, or possibly the rediscoveries of our ablest physiologists afford however, so far as I can judge, positive and direct and palpable demonstration, that the six creative

[1] Zend-Avest. vol. iii. p. 348. Hyde de rel. vet. Pers. p. 161, 162. See my Origin of Pagan Idol. book i. chap. 5. § V.

[2] Suid. Lex. Τυρρηνια.

days *must* have been six periods of vast, though to us unknown, duration.

Few subjects are more interesting than that, upon which I am now entering: and to the sound believer it is rendered doubly interesting, both by the strong light which it throws upon the Mosaical narrative, and by the wonderful and (as it were) undesigned confirmation which it affords to the scriptural verity.

1. It was long and very naturally received as a principal by Christian philosophers, that the various fossils which from time to time have been dug up from the bowels of the earth, particularly those which contain the relics of marine animals and which yet have been found in the very recesses of the largest continents, were the result of the universal deluge, and therefore gave the most incontrovertible attestation to the Mosaical record of that catastrophè.

The argument seemed valuable, at once for its brevity and its conclusiveness; for no doubt, where marine exuviæ are discovered, there at some period or other must have been the waters of the ocean: and, as such, it was constantly adduced as a most powerful auxiliary to that mass of arguments, by which the truth of this grand historical fact has been so triumphantly and so incontrovertibly established.

But, when the science of Oryctology came to be more minutely and systematically studied, difficulties gradually arose; which more and

more shewed the impropriety and the impossibility of explaining the mysteries of the subterranean world, by calling in the agency of the deluge.

(1.) Moses assures us, that pairs of all the land-animals, which existed before the flood, were preserved in the ark [1]. Hence it follows, that at least no *genus* of land-animals was lost or became extinct in consequence of that catastrophè. Modern Oryctology, however, teaches us past all reasonable controversy, that whole *genera* of animals, which now *no longer* exist and which (if we admit the inspiration of Moses) must therefore have ceased to exist *anterior* to the deluge, did actually exist at the period when their remains began to be fossilized. Such being the case, the deluge plainly cannot account for the fossil remains of animals, which had themselves ceased to exist or had become extinct *before* the deluge. To solve the difficulty, we must call in some great revolution yet more ancient than the flood; by which unknown land-animals and unknown sea-animals and unknown vegetables, all at present in a fossil state, were lodged many feet below the surface of those lands which we now inhabit [2]. But no

[1] Gen. vi. 19—22. vii. 2, 3, 8, 9. viii. 19.

[2] It is possible, I allow, that many *genera* of marine animals, as yet unknown to naturalists, may even now be in existence: but it is next to impossible, that any *genera* of the larger land animals should still be in existence, and should

such revolution took place, between the creation of man and the general deluge. Therefore the revolution must have taken place, and the animals must have become extinct, at an epoch anterior to the creation of man.

(2.) Again: rents and ruptures and disarrangements may be continually observed in the several strata of fossil bodies; which disturb their regularity, and which have evidently been produced by some mighty convulsion. But the strata *themselves*, which contain such fossil bodies, must necessarily have existed *before* the disarrangement, which they experienced from the agency of the convulsion that disturbed them. Therefore, whether that convulsion was produced by the deluge, or whether it preceded the deluge (for, in either case, the result of the argument will be the same), the fossil remains, which constitute those strata, must have existed *anterior* to the deluge, and consequently cannot be the *effects* of the deluge[1].

nevertheless have hitherto remained concealed from human observation. See this matter well discussed in Cuvier's Essay on the theory of the earth. § 25. p. 61. 4th Edit.

[1] Mr. Cuvier justly pronounces this great convulsion to have evidently been produced by a mighty flood of waters, which not more than five or six thousand years ago buried all the previously inhabited countries: but my argument will be equally conclusive, whether we ascribe the rents and ruptures in question to the agency of the general deluge or to that of some yet more ancient convulsion. Essay on the theory of the earth. § 34. p. 173, 174. Mr. Parkinson agrees

(3.) With this conclusion agrees a most remarkable fact, which perhaps on no other principle can be satisfactorily accounted for. While the fossil relics of beasts and birds and fishes and vegetables exist to such a stupendous amount, as to form even whole masses of secondary mountains; no proper fossilized portion of the human subject has ever yet been detected in the midst of this multitude of animal and vegetable fossils. Now, when we consider the millions who perished at the time of the universal deluge, so extraordinary a fact is surely most unaccountable, if we adopt the hypothesis that fossil remains are the consequence of the deluge: for, in that case, we shall be obliged to admit, that, while innumerable animals, which were then destroyed, are daily found in a fossil state throughout every part of the globe; the human species alone, with a strange exception to a general rule, entirely escaped fossilization[1].

with Mr. Cuvier on this point. Organic remains of a former world, vol. iii. p. 454. Indeed there can be no reasonable doubt, I think, that the strata were broken and dislocated, as we now find them, by the action of the deluge.

[1] It is quite undeniable, says Mr. Cuvier, that no human remains have been hitherto discovered among the extraneous fossils: and this furnishes a strong proof, that the extinct races, which are now found in a fossil state, were not varieties of known *species*, since they never could have been subjected to human influence.

When I assert, that human bones have not been hitherto found among extraneous fossils, I must be understood to speak

2. Such are the difficulties, which present themselves to those who would explain the

of fossils or petrifactions properly so called: as, in peat depositions or turf bogs and in alluvial formations as well as in ancient burying grounds, the bones of men, with those of horses and other ordinary existing *species* of animals, may readily enough be found; but, among the fossil paleotheria and elephants and rhinoceroses, the smallest fragment of human bone has never been detected. Most of the labourers in the gypsum quarries about Paris are firmly persuaded, that the bones they contain are in a great part human: but, after having seen and carefully examined many thousands of those bones, I may safely affirm, that not a single fragment of them has ever belonged to our species. I carefully examined at Pavia the collection of extraneous fossil bones brought there by Spallanzani from the island of Cerigo: and, notwithsanding the assertion of that celebrated observer, I affirm that there is not a single fragment among them that ever formed part of a human skeleton. Every where else, the fragments of bone, considered as human, have been found to belong to some animal, either when the fragments themselves have been actually examined, or even when their engraved figures have been inspected. Such real human bones, as have been found in a fossil state, belonged to bodies, which had fallen into crevices of rocks or had been left in the forsaken galleries of ancient mines and were covered up by incrustation: and I extend this assertion to the human skeletons, discovered in Guadaloupe, in a rock formed of pieces of madrepore thrown up by the sea and united by water impregnated with calcareous matter.

Every circumstance, therefore, contributes to establish this position: that the human race did not exist in the countries, in which the fossil bones of animals have been discovered, at the epoch when these bones were covered up; as there cannot be a single reason assigned, why men should have entirely

wonders of the subterranean world by calling in the agency of the flood: difficulties, if I mistake not, which are wholly insurmountable. But let us admit the six demiurgic days to be each a period of more than six millenaries; and not only will our difficulties in a great measure vanish, but we shall likewise find the very order of the fossil strata confirming in a most curious manner the strict accuracy of the Mosaical narrative.

Crude matter having been previously created out of nothing by the fiat of the Almighty, the next operation was the reducing of this crude matter into regular organized form: an operation, not instantaneous, but extending itself through six successive days or periods.

(1.) The work of the first day was the separation of light from darkness: the former henceforth constituting the natural day; and the latter, the natural night.

There is some difficulty in forming a distinct idea as to the precise nature and results of this operation. Evening and morning are said to have been the first day: yet it is clear, that

escaped from such general catastrophes, or, if they also had been destroyed and covered over at the same time, why their remains should not be now found along with those of the other animals. Essay on the theory of the earth. § 20. p. 126—133.

A fossil human skeleton from Guadaloupe, but pronounced to be of recent formation, is now in the British Museum.

such terms must not be understood according to their present or common acceptation. For the natural evening and morning are produced by the revolution of the earth round its axis, while exposed to the action of the solar rays: and the formation of the sun, we are assured, did not take place until the fourth day or period. Hence, as the evening and morning of the first day plainly could not be natural, they must, I suppose, be deemed artificial: in other words, they must simply be equivalent to *commencement* and *termination*; the evening apparently being made to precede the morning, because chaotic darkness was prior to distinct light. Still, influenced as we are by familiar existing circumstances, we find it no easy matter to conceive the existence of light, as separated from darkness, previous to the existence of its fountain or receptacle the solar orb and (we may add) the fixed stars. I can only understand this revealed fact, so as to reconcile the work of the first day with the work of the fourth day, in some such manner as that proposed by Bishop Patrick. *It seems to me most rational,* says that eminent prelate, *by this* light *to understand those particles of matter, which we call* fire *(whose two properties, every one knows, are* light *and* heat), *which the Almighty Spirit, that formed all things, produced as the great instrument for the preparation and digestion of the rest of the matter; which was still more vigourously*

moved and agitated, from the top to the bottom, by this restless element, till the purer and more shining parts of it, being separated from the grosser and united in a body fit to retain them, became light[1]. Where these igneous particles, then, were collected together in one place, there was light: and, where the gross residuum was left, there was darkness. The two separated conditions, both then and henceforth, were equivalent to day and night; though day and night, produced as they are now produced, most certainly at that time could not have been in existence[2].

(2.) By the work of the first day, the element of fire was disengaged from the crude aqueous matter which constituted the primeval Chaos: but as yet the ascent of water by exhalation was impossible, because as yet there was no atmo-

[1] Bishop Patrick's Comment. on Gen. i. 3—5.

[2] By the Hebrew word חשך, rendered in our translation *darkness*, Mr. Parkhurst understands, not a non-entity or a bare negation of light, but the celestial fluid in a stagnant inactive state: as he deems the Hebrew word אור, rendered in our translation *light*, to be the same celestial fluid in a state of activity. Whatever may be the proper interpretation of the first day's work, this at least is clear, that there could be no natural evening and morning, until the sun was formed and until the earth began to revolve on its axis. I may therefore take the present opportunity of remarking, that, as the sun was not made until the fourth day, no argument can be fairly drawn, from the phraseology *evening and morning*, in favour of the six days being six natural solar days; an argument, which, I believe, has sometimes been adduced.

sphere. The work therefore of the second day was to disengage the element of air from the same discordant mass, as that from which the element of fire had been previously disengaged: and, when this was accomplished, a separation of the waters immediately and necessarily took place. For, when fire acted upon the great aqueous congeries, and when the atmosphere was now ready to receive all the particles raised by exhalation, the waters were forthwith divided from the waters: some remaining below in an unevaporated state; and others ascending above, thence to return, from time to time, in the form of rain or snow.

Our English translation, copying the Greek of the Seventy rather than the Hebrew of the original, has expressed the word, which Moses employs to designate the air, by the term *firmament*. Its proper and literal import is *the expansion:* and so it doubtless ought to have been rendered; for the word *firmament* by no means exhibits the real idea of the Hebrew substantive. In truth, no single term could have been found more happily expressive of the leading property of air, than that which Moses has here selected: for its vast powers of *expansion,* by which it stands very remarkably contradistinguished from the fluid of water, are well known to every physiologist.

This expansion or atmosphere is designated by the appellation of *heaven;* a name clearly

indicative of that material heaven, through which the birds of the air wing their devious course, and which supports the higher waters in a state of solution.

(3.) The work of the third day was the separation of the lower waters from the element of earth and the consequent production of every sort of vegetables.

During the earlier part of this period, the granitic and other primary rocks, which constitute as it were the skeleton of our globe, must plainly have been formed: and, when the waters were collected together into the bed of the ocean, and when a sufficient quantity of productive soil had been generated upon the dry surface of the primary rocks, then, during the later part of the period, the earth was made to bring forth grass and herbs and trees.

Let us now suppose, that the length of the third day was more than six thousand years; and what will be the consequence of such a supposition? Doubtless the whole face of the earth, already separated from the waters, would soon become overspread with a rank and luxuriant vegetation: one generation of trees and plants would succeed another: a large accumulation of vegetable mould would be produced through their decomposition; and, either by one of those sudden and mighty revolutions which appear to have repeatedly agitated this globe previous to the formation of God's last

work *man*[1], or even (we may venture to say) in the ordinary course of nature itself, vast

[1] The changes, says Mr. Cuvier, which have taken place in the productions of the shelly strata, have not been entirely owing to a gradual and general retreat of the waters, but to successive irruptions and retreats; the final result of which, however, has been an universal depression of the level of the sea. These repeated irruptions and retreats of the sea have been neither slow nor gradual: most of the catastrophes, which have occasioned them, have been sudden: and this is easily proved, especially with regard to the last of them, the traces of which are most conspicuous. The breaking to pieces and overturnings of the strata, which happened in former catastrophes, shew plainly enough, that they were sudden and violent like the last: and the heaps of *debris* and rounded pebbles, which are found in various places among the solid strata, demonstrate the vast force of the motions excited in the mass of waters by these overturnings. Life, therefore, has been often disturbed on this earth by terrible events; calamities, which, at their commencement, have perhaps moved and overturned to a great depth the entire outer crust of the globe, but which, since these first commotions, have uniformly acted at a less depth and less generally. Numberless living beings have been the victims of these catastrophes: some have been destroyed by sudden inundations, others have been laid dry in consequence of the bottom of the seas being instantaneously elevated. Such are the conclusions, which necessarily result from the objects that we meet with at every step of our inquiry, and which we can always verify by examples drawn from almost every country. Every part of the globe bears the impress of these great and terrible events so distinctly, that they must be visible to all who are qualified to read their history in the remains which they have left behind. But, what is still more astonishing and not less certain, there have not been always

masses of fallen timber would be plunged beneath the surface of extensive bogs and morasses; there, through the process either of stony accretion or of bitumenous fermentation, to be gradually transmuted partly into fossil wood and partly into fossil coal. On this hypothesis, little need we be astonished at the huge stores of the last-mentioned invaluable mineral: little need we perplex ourselves to account for the existence of those enormous forests, which at some period or other must have been buried under the ground. A term of more than six millenaries will have produced timber and plants and herbs, amply sufficient both for the formation of vegetable mould and for the production of the most extensive coal mines.

(4.) As yet there was heat and a general diffusion of fiery light, though as yet there was no sun: hence, as in a hot-house, germination would proceed without interruption. But, when the fourth day arrived, God, we are told, formed and placed in the material heaven the sun and the moon and the whole collective body of the stars: from that time therefore the succession of natural day and night, of morning and even-

living creatures on the earth; and it is easy for the observer to discover the period at which animal productions began to be deposited. Essay on the theory of the earth. § 5, 6. p. 15—17.

ing, of months and of years, and perhaps of summer and winter, would commence.

Such is the simple account of the matter, given us by Moses: and, since we can know nothing of the order and process of God's demiurgic labours beyond what he himself is pleased to teach us, and since we have abundant reason to believe that the Hebrew lawgiver was divinely inspired, I do not feel any way anxious to account for what short-sighted mortals might please to deem a palpable disproportion in the amount of the several works which are ascribed to the six days. To argue, in fact, from such disproportion against the veracity of the narrative, is the height of presumptuous childishness: for every argument of that description is virtually built upon the assumption, that the powers of God are to be measured like the powers of man, that the lapse of time bears the same relation to him as to ourselves, and that to the Almighty it is more laborious to effect comparatively much in a comparatively short period than comparatively little in a comparatively long period. On this abundantly obvious principle, unless we choose to maintain that it is more difficult for the Supreme Being to create a world or an assemblage of worlds in a moment than in a million of years, we may well be content to acquiesce in the demiurgic arrangement propounded to us by the voice of inspiration; however we may be struck (to

speak after the manner of men) with its semblance of disproportion.

(5.) The work of the fifth day was two-fold: during the earlier part of it, the waters brought forth fishes; during the later part of it, they produced birds.

Here we may argue just in the same manner as in the last case. Some great mundane revolution, or rather several great mundane revolutions, must have taken place ere the commencement of the sixth day, and therefore in the course of the third and fourth and fifth days. The perpetual discovery of fossil fishes and of other marine exuviæ in the very centre of the largest continents, deposited *above* the strata of fossil wood and vegetables, sufficiently demonstrates, with respect to one of these revolutions, not merely that the waters of the ocean must have *passed over* those continents, but that the continents themselves must at some remote period have been the *permanent* bed of the ocean: for, as physiologists are well aware, a *temporary* inundation is wholly insufficient to account for the phenomena which present themselves [1].

[1] The lowest and most level parts of the earth, when penetrated to a very great depth, says Mr. Cuvier, exhibit nothing but horizontal strata, composed of various substances, and containing almost all of them innumerable marine productions. Similar strata, with the same kind of productions, compose the hills even to a great height. Sometimes the

It was on this ground, if I mistake not, that Cuvier and de Luc have been led to form a diluvian theory, in which it is contended that the flood was produced by means of a complete interchange of land and water: so that we are at present dwelling on the ancient bed of the antediluvian ocean, while the antediluvian continents are now submerged beneath the seas which roll between our postdiluvian continents [1].

shells are so numerous, as to constitute the entire body of the stratum. They are almost every where in such a perfect state of preservation, that even the smallest of them retain their most delicate parts, their sharpest ridges, and their finest and tenderest processes. They are found in elevations far above the level of every part of the ocean, and in places to which the sea could not be conveyed by any existing cause. They are not only inclosed in loose sand, but are often incrusted and penetrated on all sides by the hardest stones. Every part of the earth, each hemisphere, every continent, every island of any size, exhibits the same phenomenon. We are therefore forcibly led to believe, not only that the sea has at one period or another covered all our plains, but that it must have remained there for a long time and in a state of tranquillity; which circumstance was necessary for the formation of deposits, so extensive, so thick, in part so solid, and containing exuviæ so perfectly preserved. Essay on the theory of the earth. § 4. p. 7, 8.

[1] I am of opinion then, says Mr. Cuvier, with Mr. de Luc and Mr. Dolomieu, that, if there is any circumstance thoroughly established in geology, it is, that the crust of our globe has been subjected to a great and sudden revolution, the epoch of which cannot be dated much farther back than five or six thousand years; that this revolution had buried all the countries, which were before inhabited by men and by the other

Such a theory, however, is so wholly irreconcileable with the Mosaical history both of the antediluvian world and of the deluge itself and of the postdiluvian world, in which the four Asiatic *antediluvian* rivers are geographically marked out and determined and identified by *postdiluvian* characteristics, that it cannot for a moment be admitted by any consistent believer in the scriptural verity[1]. Nor is it more reconcileable with the actually existing phenomena of the bones of land-animals, found under circumstances which prove them to have *inhabited* the *precise* regions where these their relics have been discovered: for, had the regions in question been the bed of the antediluvian ocean (as Cuvier and de Luc suppose), it is clear that no *land-animals* could have *inhabited* them[2]. Yet,

animals that are now best known; *that the same revolution had laid dry the bed of the last ocean, which now forms all the countries at present inhabited;* that the small number of individuals of men and other animals, that escaped from the effects of that great revolution, have since propagated and spread over the lands then newly laid dry; and, consequently, that the human race has only resumed a progressive state of improvement since that epoch, by forming established societies, raising monuments, collecting natural facts, and constructing systems of science and of learning. Essay on the theory of the earth. § 34. p. 173, 174.

[1] See this argument pursued at large in my Origin of Pagan Idolatry. book ii. chap. 1. § I.

[2] The phenomena, to which I allude, seem to me quite decisive as to the fact, that we now inhabit the very same

on the other hand, most plain and certain is it, that we are now inhabiting the bed of a primeval

tracts of land that our antediluvian forefathers did, and consequently that we are not now living upon the bed of the antediluvian ocean.

In various parts of the world, caves have been discovered containing numerous bones of land-animals, which certainly could not have been there deposited by the action of water. Hence the obvious inference is, an inference in truth drawn by Cuvier himself, that *the animals, to which those bones belonged, must have lived and died peaceably on the spot where we now find them:* and the propriety of this inference is further established by the nature of the earthy matter in which the bones are inveloped; for, according to Laugier, it contains an intermixture of animal matter with phosphate of lime and probably also phosphate of iron. But, if this inference be well founded, then it is plainly impossible, that our present tracts of land can have constituted the bed of the antediluvian ocean: because, in that case, the animals could not, before the deluge, have *inhabited* the regions where their bones are now found; such regions, according to the theory of Cuvier, having constituted the bed of the ocean as it existed immediately before the deluge.

As the subject is of no small importance, the inference in question clearly confirming the Mosaical history which describes the present race of men as inhabiting the self-same tracts of land which were inhabited by their antediluvian forefathers, it may not be uninteresting to adduce some of the facts on which the inference is founded.

1. Remains of the skeletons of animals are found in great abundance in limestone caves in Germany and Hungary. The bones occur nearly in the same state in all these caves; detached, broken, but never rolled: and, consequently, they have not been brought from a distance by the agency of water. They are somewhat lighter and less compact than

ocean; that is to say, a range of countries which were once permanently occupied by the oceanic

recent bones, but slightly decomposed, contain much gelatine, and are never mineralized. They are generally inveloped in an indurated earth, which contains animal matter; sometimes in a kind of alabaster or calcareous sinter: and, by means of this mineral, they are sometimes attached to the walls of the caves. These bones are the same in all the caves hitherto examined: and it is worthy of remark, that they occur in an extent of upwards of 200 leagues. Cuvier estimates, that rather more than three fourths of these bones belong to *species* of bears now extinct; while one half or two thirds of the remaining fourth belong to a *species* of hyena. A very small number of these remains belong to a species of the *genus* lion or tiger: and another, to animals of the dog or wolf kinds. Lastly, the smallest portion belongs to different *species* of smaller carnivorous animals, as the fox and polecat. It is quite evident, that these bones could not have been introduced into these caves by the action of water, because the smallest processes or inequalities on their surface are preserved. Cuvier is therefore inclined to conjecture, that *the animals, to which they belonged, must have lived and died peaceably on the spot where we now find them.*

2. The relics of several *species* of Mastodons have been found in various parts of America. The beds, which contain them, are generally alluvial, either sandy or marly, and always near the earth's surface. In many places, they are accompanied with accumulations of marine animal-remains: and, in other places, the sand and marl which cover them contain only fresh-water shells. The catastrophe, which has buried them, appears to have been a transient marine inundation. The bones are neither rolled nor in skeletons; but dispersed, and in part broken or fractured. They have not therefore been brought there from a distance by an inundation: but have been found by it in the places where it has covered

waters. Under these circumstances, therefore, the result is obvious. We now inhabit the bed,

them; as might be expected, if the animals to which they belonged had dwelt in these places, and had there successively died. Hence it appears, that, before this catastrophe, *these animals lived in the countries where we now find their bones.*

3. Exactly the same inference is drawn by Mr. Buckland from the teeth and bones of various animals discovered in a cave at Kirkdale, near Kirby-Moorside, in Yorkshire. The den of Kirkdale is a natural fissure or cavern in the oolite limestone, extending 300 feet into the solid rock, and varying from two to five feet in height and breadth. The bottom of the cavern is nearly horizontal; and is entirely covered to the depth of about a foot with a sediment of mud, deposited by diluvian waters. At the bottom of the mud, the floor of the cave was covered from one end to the other with teeth and fragments of bones of the following animals: hyena, elephant, rhinoceros, hippopotamus, horse, ox, two or three *species* of deer, bear, fox, water-rat, and birds. The bones are for the most part broken and gnawed to pieces: and the teeth lie loose among the fragments of the bones. The hyena bones are broken to pieces as much as those of the other animals. No bone or tooth has been rolled or the least acted on by water, nor is there any gravel mixed with them. The bones are not at all mineralized, and retain nearly the whole of their animal gelatine; owing their high state of preservation to the mud in which they have been imbedded. The teeth of the hyenas are most abundant: and, of these, the greater part are worn down almost to the stumps, as if by the operation of gnawing bones. Portions of the dung of the hyena are found also in this den, which on analysis, afforded the same constituent parts as that of canine animals. *It is certain, that all these animals lived and died in the district where their remains are now found, in the period immediately preceding*

indeed, of a primeval ocean. But the ocean, whose bed we inhabit, was not the antediluvian ocean or the ocean as it existed *immediately* before the deluge: because, according both to actually existing phenomena and to the inspired history in its plain and necessary construction, we now inhabit the very same tracts of land (allowing for those smaller alterations, which a convulsion like the flood would of course produce), that our antediluvian predecessors formerly inhabited. Therefore the primeval ocean, whose bed we now inhabit, must have been an ocean, which, as *thus* situated, was in existence prior to the creation of man.

On such necessary grounds, I conclude, that the sea and the land must, to a certain extent, have changed places (and *that* too for a sufficient length of time to produce existing phenomena) in the course at least of the fifth day of the

the deluge. The bones were carried into the cave, as food, by the hyenas; the smaller animals perhaps entire, the larger ones piecemeal: for by no other means could the bones of such large animals as the elephant, rhinoceros, and hippopotamus, have arrived at the inmost recesses of so small a fissure, unless rolled thither by water; under which circumstance the angles would have been worn off by attrition, which is not the case. See Jameson's Notes subjoined to Cuvier's Essay. p. 364—369, 385—387.

So far as I can judge of evidence, the above is decisive as to the question whether we are now inhabiting the bed of the ocean as it existed immediately before the deluge.

creation, to say nothing of those yet more ancient revolutions which have apparently occurred during the lapse of the third and fourth days [1].

This revolution of the fifth day would place fossil fishes and fossil birds *above* fossil wood and fossil vegetables.

(6.) The work of the sixth day was the formation, first of beasts and reptiles, and lastly of man.

Now, in the arrangement of the sixth period, it is obvious that man was made at its very close: consequently, on the scale of proportion which has been adopted from the measure of the seventh day or the divine sabbath, more than six thousand years of it must have elapsed ere the human pair began to exist. In the course then of these six thousand years, I suppose an-

[1] The various catastrophès of our planet, says Mr. Cuvier, have not only caused the different parts of our continent to rise by degrees from the basin of the sea; but it has also frequently happened, that lands, which had been laid dry, have been again covered by the water, in consequence, either of these lands sinking down below the level of the sea, or of the sea being raised above the level of the lands. The particular portions of the earth also, which the sea has abandoned by its last retreat, had been laid dry once before, and had at that time produced quadrupeds, birds, plants, and all kinds of terrestrial productions: it had then been inundated by the sea, which has since retired from it, and left it to be occupied by its own proper inhabitants. Essay on the theory of the earth. § 5. p. 14.

other great mundane revolution to have occurred, either gradual or convulsive; which led to the production of fossil animals and fossil reptiles, which extinguished whole *genera* now no longer existing save in a fossil form, and which caused another interchange of land and ocean.

This final revolution made the face of the globe, in regard to the two great divisions of land and water, nearly what it was prior to the revolution of the fifth day, nearly what it was during the existence of the antediluvian world, and nearly what it is at present: for the primitive land, which at first was wholly occupied by vegetables, changed places with the primitive ocean; and again the secondary land, prior to the formation of man, changed places with the secondary ocean.

The consequence of these two revolutions would be: that our present land, though once the bed of a secondary ocean, coincides pretty nearly with the primitive land; that many whole *genera* of plants and animals would become utterly extinct, though many would be preserved alive for the use of their future master man; and that, as the revolution of the fifth day would place fossil birds and fossil fishes *above* fossil wood and fossil vegetables, so the counter-revolution of the sixth day would place fossil land-animals and fossil reptiles *above* fossil birds and fossil fishes.

3. Through these mighty changes, we are now dwelling upon the organic remains or the fossilated ruins of the productions of the third and fifth and sixth demiurgic periods: and wonderful is the mercy and goodness displayed in this gradual forming of our habitation. By such a process, a store of fuel is laid up in the bowels of the earth ready for our use; when, by the increase of the human species, the forests, which always spread themselves over uninhabited countries, should gradually disappear: and secondary rocks, convenient for every purpose of ornament or utility, are provided; when the primary granitic rocks would, from their unyielding hardness, have been nearly impracticable.

4. With the theory thus exhibited, the actual formation of our globe perfectly agrees: and, what to the Christian is most deeply interesting, this very formation, after it has been thoroughly examined and systematized, serves to corroborate the minute accuracy of the brief scriptural history of the creation. Thus, in an age of spurious reason and daring infidelity, does proof accumulate upon proof, that the Bible is indeed the word of God.

(1.) Moses assures us, that the primitive waters of Chaos were once universally diffused, so that the dry land or the rocks of the first formation did not appear; and that, when these waters were originally gathered together into one place, and when the rudiments of the earth had thence

forthwith emerged above their surface, they did not immediately support any living bodies: for the separation of land and water took place on the third day, whereas fishes were not made until the fifth day[1].

Exactly similar is the testimony of Mr. Cuvier, deduced from a close scrutiny into the conformation of the globe which we inhabit.

It is impossible to deny, says he, *that the waters of the sea have formerly, and for a long time, covered those masses of matter which now constitute our highest mountains; and farther, that these waters, during a long time, did not support any living bodies. Thus, it has not been only since the commencement of animal life, that these numerous changes and revolutions have taken place in the constitution of the external covering of our globe: for the masses, formed previous to that event, have suffered changes, as well as those which have been formed since. They have also suffered violent changes in their positions: and a part of these assuredly took place, while they existed alone, and before they were covered over by the shelly masses. The proof of this lies in the overturnings, the disruptions, and the fissures, which are observable in their strata, as well as in those of more recent formation, which are there even in greater number and better defined*[2].

[1] Gen. i. 9, 10, 20—23.

[2] Essay on the theory of the earth. § 7. p. 21, 22. See also § 6. p. 17.

(2.) Moses teaches us, that the earth was brought into its present state, not instantaneously, but by a series of consecutive operations which he assigns to several different periods, each period being styled *a day*[1].

Such also is the conclusion, forced by the observation of naked facts upon Mr. Cuvier.

The importance, says he, *of investigating the relations of extraneous fossils with the strata in which they are contained, is quite obvious. It is to them alone that we owe the commencement even of a Theory of the earth: as, but for them, we could never have even suspected that there had existed any successive epochs in the formation of our earth, and a series of different and consecutive operations in reducing it to its present state. By them alone we are enabled to ascertain, with the utmost certainty, that our earth has not always been covered over by the same external crust: because we are thoroughly assured, that the organized bodies, to which these fossil remains belong, must have lived upon the surface, before they came to be buried, as they now are, at a great depth*[2].

(3.) Moses describes the occurrence of no more than a single formation of each class of vegetables and animals: so that, although many *genera* may have become extinct anterior to the formation of man, and although many *species* of

[1] Gen. i.

[2] Essay on the theory of the earth. § 23. p. 54, 55.

genera now existing may have perished in the waters of the deluge, still no new formation of any new *species* or *genus* has subsequently occurred [1].

With this account the opinion of Mr. Cuvier perfectly and remarkably agrees.

To a superficial inquirer it might appear strange, that whole *genera* of now unknown animals and plants should have been destroyed by those primeval revolutions to which our globe

[1] Gen. i. It may be said, that the allowed and certain fact, of many *genera* of animals having become extinct anterior to the creation of man, contradicts the scriptural doctrine, that death first entered into the world through the fall.

To this I reply, that by the fall *man* indeed first became subject to death, agreeably to the original penalty imposed upon eating the forbidden fruit; but no intimation is given, that *the brute creation* then first became liable to it.

Milton poetically represents Adam and Eve, as beholding the slaughter of animals by animals, for the first time, immediately after the fall: this, however, is warranted, neither by Scripture, nor by the peculiar conformation of rapacious and carnivorous animals. On the contrary, as it is a palpable fact, that myriads of birds and beasts and fishes must have perished before even the formation of man; so it strikes me as highly probable, that, in the way of a merciful warning, our aboriginal parents had been presented with the spectacle of animal death, both natural and violent, previous to the day of their unhappy transgression. They were solemnly assured, that the penalty of eating the forbidden fruit was *death*. Hence it is reasonable to believe, that the threat did not denounce something wholly unknown to them, but that in the death of animals they had beheld a striking exemplification of their own fate in case of disobedience.

has been subjected, and yet that the now existing *genera* of each should have been preserved. Hence such an enquirer might be apt to fancy, that the destroyed *genera* and the now existing *genera* could never have been contemporaneous, but that the latter must have been formed at an era subsequent to the destruction of the former.

The very reverse however of this conclusion is drawn by Mr. Cuvier. Totally different animals and vegetables, he remarks, are found to flourish in different countries.

The great continents, says he, *as Asia, Africa, the two Americas, and New Holland, have large quadrupeds; and, generally speaking, contain species proper to each: insomuch, that, upon discovering countries which are insulated from the rest of the world, the animals they contain of the class of quadrupeds were found entirely different from those which existed in other countries. Thus, when the Spaniards first penetrated into South America, they did not find it to contain a single quadruped exactly the same with those of Europe, Asia, and Africa. The puma, the jaguar, the tapir, the capybara, the lama, the vicugna, and the whole tribe of sapajous, were to them entirely new animals, of which they had not the smallest idea. Similar circumstances have recurred in our own time, when the coasts of New Holland and the adjacent islands were first examined. The species of the kangaroo, phascoloma, dasyurus, peramela, phalanger or flying opossum, with the hairy and spinous duck-billed animals*

denominated ornithorynchus and echidna, have astonished zoölogists by presenting new and strange conformations, contrary to all former rules, and incapable of being reduced under any of the former systems[1].

Upon this statement, he afterwards argues in the following manner with reference to now extinct *genera* and *species*.

When I endeavour to prove, that the rocky strata contain the bony remains of several genera, and the loose strata those of several species, all of which are animals not now existing on the face of our globe, I do not pretend, that a new creation was required for calling our present races into existence. I only urge, that they did not anciently occupy the same places, and that they must have come from some other part of the globe. Let us suppose, for instance, that a prodigious inroad of the sea were now to cover the continent of New Holland with a coat of sand and other earthy materials. This would necessarily bury the carcases of many animals belonging to the genera of kangaroo, phascoloma, dasyurus, peramela, flying phalangers, echidna, and ornithorynchus; and conseqnently would entirely extinguish all the species of all these genera, as not one of them is to be found in any other country. Were the same revolution to lay dry the numerous narrow straits which separate New Holland from New Guinea, the Indian islands, and the continent of

[1] Essay on the theory of the earth. § 25. p. 62, 63.

Asia, a road would be opened for the elephants, rhinoceroses, buffaloes, horses, camels, tigers, and all the other Asiatic animals, to occupy a land in which they are hitherto unknown. Were some future naturalist, after becoming well acquainted with the living animals of that country in this supposed new condition, to search below the surface on which these animals were nourished, he would then discover the remains of quite different races. What New Holland would then be, under these hypothetical circumstances, Europe, Siberia, and a large portion of America, actually now are. Perhaps hereafter, when other countries shall be investigated, and New Holland among the rest, they also may be found to have all undergone similar revolutions, and perhaps may have made reciprocal changes of animal productions. If we push the former supposition somewhat farther, and, after the supply of Asiatic animals to New Holland, admit that a subsequent catastrophè might overwhelm Asia, the primitive country of the migrated animals, future geologists and naturalists would perhaps be equally at a loss to discover whence the then living animals of New Holland had come, as we now are to find out the original habitations of our present fossil animals[1].

(4.) Moses, in the order of formation which he distributes, through six distinct periods, represents the primitive rocks as being first separated from the chaotic waters; plants and

[1] Essay on the theory of the earth. § 31. p. 126—128.

vegetables as being next made; afterwards fishes; after them birds; next, land-animals and reptiles; and, last of all, the human species[1]. Hence, if the six days were six periods, each of a very great length; and if, previous to the formation of man, those mundane revolutions occurred, which the frame of the earth requires us to acknowledge: then the order of the strata, provided the scriptural cosmogony be authentic, must correspond with the order of formation as detailed by Moses. In other words, the granitic or primitive rocks, though they may pierce upward through all the other strata to the tops of the highest mountains, must be the lowest; and, at the same time, they must be free from all organic remains, inasmuch as all organized bodies were formed *subsequent* to their emergence from the waters: next must come plants and vegetables: next, fishes: next, birds: next, land-animals and reptiles: and, last of all, should any such be found to exist, fossil human relics. Occasional intermixtures may indeed take place: but still the first remains of birds, for instance, will not be discovered below the first remains of marine animals; nor the first remains of land-animals, below the first remains of birds.

Accordingly, such is actually found to be the succession of organized fossils. They all rest

[1] Gen. i. 9, 11, 12, 20—22, 24—27.

upon the primitive granite, which contains no extraneous fossil relics: and they follow each other upward in the precise order of the Mosaical narrative.

The formation of the exterior part of this globe and the creation of its several inhabitants, says Mr. Parkinson, *must have been the work of a vast length of time, and must have been effected at several distant periods.*

In the first of these periods, the granitic and other primary rocks were separated from the water[1]. *That this separation took place, as is stated in the scriptural record, previous to the creation of vegetables and animals, is evident from the circumstance of no remains of any organized substance having been ever found in any of these substances.*

In the next period, we are informed by scripture, the creation of vegetables took place[2]. *Almost every circumstance in the situation and disposition of coal accords with this order of creation; excepting that, in many of the coal measures, the alternating limestones are full of the remains of shells. But, on the other hand, it must be observed, that, as the formation of coal may have taken place soon after the creation of vegetables, and have continued even to a late period; so, consequently, the accompanying strata may vary materially as to their contents. In the later formation*[3], *the remains of marine animals may be*

[1] Gen. i. 9. [2] Gen. i. 12.

[3] That is to say, when the primitive continents, as they existed on the third day, became the bed of the ocean.

expected to be met with: but, in the earliest formation, that which is found on granite and accompanied by porphyry and green-stone or the like, it is probable that no remains of animals would be found; and fair proof would be yielded of an accordance, in this instance, between the order of creation as related by Moses and the order in which the investing strata of the earth are disposed.

The creation of the succeeding period, according to the scriptural relation, was that of the inhabitants of the water and of the air[1]. *In agreement with this order of creation, are the contents of all the numerous strata lying above those already mentioned; including the blue clay, which is disposed in many places almost at the surface. In all these strata no remains are to be found, but those of the inhabitants of the waters; excepting those of birds, which exist, though rarely, in some particular spots. But in none of these strata has a single relic been met with, which can be supposed to have belonged to any terrestrial animal.*

In the next period, it is stated, that the beasts of the earth, cattle, and every thing that creepeth upon the earth, were made[2]. *The agreement of the situations, in which the remains of land-animals are found, with this stated order of creation, is exceedingly exact; since it is only, on the surface, or in some superficial stratum, or in comparatively some lately formed deposition, that any remains of these animals are to be found.*

[1] Gen. i. 20. [2] Gen. i. 24.

The creation of man, we are informed, was the work of the concluding portion of *the last period*[1]: *and, in agreement with his having been created after all the other inhabitants of the earth, is the fact, that not a single decided fossil relic of man has been discovered*[2].

This last circumstance will be considered by many, as contradictory to the account of the deluge; by which the earth, with man, is said to have been destroyed: since, in the remains of the deluged world, man might be expected to be found in subterraneous situations. The fact however is, that, although no remains of man are found, the surface of the earth, which is inhabited by man, displays, even at the present day, manifest and decided marks of the mechanical agency of violent currents of water. Nor is there a single stratum of all those which have been mentioned, that does not exhibit undeniable proofs of its having been broken, and even dislocated, by some tremendous power, which has acted with considerable violence on this planet, since the deposition of the strata of even the latest formation[3].

[1] Gen. i. 26.

[2] I have already noticed the exceptions to this remark; and have stated the grounds, on which Cuvier, notwithstanding their existence, scruples not roundly to assert, that *no human remains have been hitherto discovered among the extraneous fossils.*

[3] Hence, as I have argued above, the fossil animals contained in these dislocated strata cannot have been there deposited by the deluge: for, if the solid strata, which con-

From the whole of this examination, a pleasing and perhaps unexpected accordance appears, between the order in which (according to the scriptural account) creation was accomplished, and the order in which the fossil remains of creation are found deposited in the superficial layers of the earth. So close indeed is the agreement, that the Mosaic account is thereby confirmed in every respect, except as to the age of the world and the distance of time between the completion of different parts of the creation. These, in consequence of the literal acceptation of the word DAY *in that account, are reckoned to be much less than what every examination of the earth's structure authorizes their being supposed. But, if the word* DAY *be admitted, as figuratively designing certain indefinite periods in which particular parts of the great work of creation were accomplished; no difficulty will then remain. The age of the world, according to the scriptural account, will then agree with that which is manifested by the phenomena of its stratification*[1].

On the whole, does it not appear, from this repeated occurrence of new beings, from the late ap-

tain them, were dislocated by the deluge; the strata themselves, with their fossil contents, must have been formed before the deluge.

[1] We have seen above, that, even if no researches had been made into the bowels of the earth, we should have been obliged to conclude, from the tenor of the scriptural account itself, that the six days were in truth six periods each of a vast length.

pearance of the remains of land-animals, and from the total absence of the fossil remains of man, that the creative power, as far as respects this planet, has been exercised continually or at distant periods, and with increasing excellence in its objects, to a comparatively late period: the last and highest work appearing to be man, whose remains have not yet been numbered among the subjects of the mineral kingdom[1]?

[1] Parkinson's Organic Remains of a former world, vol. iii. p. 449—455. The plate, prefixed to Cuvier's Essay on the theory of the earth, gives a most distinct idea of the series of strata, with their extraneous fossils, reckoning upwards from the primitive rocks; which, being separated from the chaotic waters *prior* to the formation of any organized beings (as Moses assures us), contain no fossil organic remains. The order is, as follows.

I. Primitive rocks—No fossil organic remains.

II. Transition rocks—First appearance of fossil shells and corals.

III. First sand stone or old red sand stone and old red conglomerate—Fossil wood.

IV. First limestone or mountain limestone—Fossil corals and shells.

V. Coal formation—Impressions of plants, many with a tropical aspect.

VI. New red conglomerate.

VII. Second limestone or magnesian limestone—First appearance of fossil fishes and of fossil oviparous quadrupeds.

VIII. Second sandstone or new red sandstone—Fossil shells, corals, and vegetables.

IX. Third limestone or Jura oölite and lias limestones—Fossil shells, corals, lacertæ, fishes, and vegetables.

X. Third sandstone or green sand.

5. Perhaps I ought to remark, that, while the necessity of an extension of time, between the epoch of primeval creation properly so called and the commencement of that seventh day on which God rested from his labours, is felt by all who have attended to the internal phenomena of the earth; some persons, unwilling to view the six demiurgic days under any other aspect than that of six natural days, have chosen rather to seek such extension of time antecedent to the first of the six days than during their lapse. This being the case, we have our choice of two theories. The one is, *that the six days are six periods, each of immense length; and that, in the course of these six periods, the universal organization of crude matter was effected:* the other is, *that a very wide organization of crude matter took place prior even to the first of the six days; that the six days themselves are six natural days; and that during their lapse was effected that subsequent organization, of which alone, in his cosmogony, Moses is to be understood as treating.*

XI. Fourth limestone and chalk—Fossil shells, corals, lacertæ, turtles, and fishes.

XII. Brown coal formation.

XIII. Hertfordshire pudding stone.

XIV. Paris formation—First appearance of fossil remains of birds and mammiferous animals.

XV. Remains of extinct species of elephant, rhinoceros, hippopotamus, tapir, deer, hyena, bear.

XVI. Fossil remains of the human species first appear in this formation.

Of these two theories, I have adopted the first: and the reason of my preference is, because it quadrates at once, both with the actually ascertained order of fossil stratification, and with the most obvious interpretation of the sacred narrative.

(1.) As for the order of fossil stratification, it is found exactly to agree with the order observed in the work of the six days: so that the alleged productions of an earlier day are constantly discovered *beneath* the alleged productions of a later day.

Now this remarkable coincidence affords, so far as I can judge, a physical demonstration, that the order of the six days and the order of fossil stratification stand immediately connected together in the way of cause and effect. For, unless this be admitted, we must ascribe, not very philosophically, the uniform coincidence in question to mere unmeaning chance.

(2.) With a deduction, thus natural, from the order of fossil stratification, corresponds the most obvious interpretation of the sacred narrative.

Moses, as the Hebrew doctors uniformly contend[1], and as indeed is sufficiently plain from the whole tenor of his discourse, teaches us: that God first created the rude indigested matter of the heaven and the earth; and that after-

[1] See my Origin of Pagan Idolatry. book i. chap. 2. § XII.

wards, in the course of what are styled *six days*, he reduced this indigested matter into regular form or meet organization.

Two distinct acts, then, are ascribed to God: the one, *the act of creation properly so called*, by which the materials of the universe were produced out of nothing; the other, *the act of formation out of the previously created materials*, which act of formation is said to have continued operating through six successive days.

Now I will venture to assert, that any person, perusing the Mosaical narrative and at the same time carefully bearing in his mind the two distinct acts of *creation* and *formation*, will clearly perceive, that the theory of *an organization or formation of crude matter* ANTECEDENT *to the first of the six days* is not only unauthorized by the scriptural history but is altogether contradictory to it. For, when a writer tells us, that God first created rude matter, and that afterwards in the course of six days he reduced that rude matter into regularly organized forms: we are, I think, obliged to conclude, unless we make such a writer gratuitously violate the most obvious rules of intelligible composition, that no act of formation took place prior to the first of the six days. How long a time matter might remain in a chaotic state, we are not instructed: but certainly, according to the plain unsophisticated language of Moses, the formation or

extrication of light on the first day IMMEDIATELY succeeded the chaotic state of the universe; so that, ANTECEDENT to the formation of light, there had been no formation whatsoever. Hence it follows, that, consistently with Scripture, we cannot admit a period of organization or formation PRIOR to the period of the six days. But, if this conclusion be valid, then it will also follow, since an extension of time is required by the existing phenomena of our earth, that the six days must be extended into six periods each of vast though undetermined amplitude.

6. The extension of the six demiurgic days into six very long periods most effectually nullifies the infidel objection drawn from the ancient eruptions of mount Etna.

In penetrating through the surface of the neighbouring ground, it has been discovered, that there are many different strata of lava, and that between each two strata of lava there is a stratum of earth. Now the time, requisite for the deposition of each stratum of earth upon a stratum of lava ere that stratum of earth was covered by a new stratum of lava, has been laboriously calculated on principles which may or may not be just; and the result of this calculation has been, that the earliest eruption of mount Etna must have taken place many thousand years before the era of the formation of

man according to the Mosaical account. Hence the conclusion is, that the Mosaical history of the creation cannot be true, and therefore that Moses cannot have been an inspired prophet.

I am perfectly ready to concede to the infidel the full benefit of this argument, though there are positions in it which might well be disputed. Let it however be granted, that many eruptions of Etna took place anterior to the formation of man, and that some of those eruptions may have occurred (we will say) 30,000 years ago: what then? Does such a concession at all tend to disprove the scriptural chronology of man's formation? Most assuredly not: for, if the six demiurgic days each exceeded a term of six thousand years, we shall have quite time enough for the eruptions even prior to the formation of man without there being any need to impugn the scriptural chronology of that event.

The high antiquity of the eruptions of Etna is indisputable: for Thucydides mentions one, which occurred in the sixth year of the Peloponnesian war or in the year A.C. 425, and which itself was the third that had happened since Sicily was colonized by the Greeks; and I strongly suspect, from the poetical machinery employed by Jeremiah, who flourished from the year A.C. 628 down to the Babylonian captivity, that he was by no means ignorant of the existence of that burning mountain, having pro-

bably learned it from the Phenician mariners [1]. I see therefore no objection to the hypothesis, that it may have been in action long before the formation of man. To the same distantly remote period we ought perhaps to ascribe the operations of many volcanos, which are now extinct and which have been extinct beyond the recollection of history. Fire and water seem to have been the grand secondary agents of God in his plastic labours during the six demiurgic periods [2].

[1] Thucyd. de bell. Pelop. lib. iii. § 116. Jerem. li. 25. See also Æschyl. Prom. ver. 351—373.

[2] As there is nothing to forbid the extension of the six demiurgic days to six periods, each of vast though indefinite length; by which one of the objections of Infidelity is effectually removed: so it is not a little satisfactory to observe the equally complete destruction of another by the masterly conclusions deduced by Mr. Cuvier from existing facts and circumstances.

It has been not unfrequently the humour of unbelievers, to maintain that man must have existed during a much greater space of time than that allotted to him even by the longest scriptural account, and to endeavour wholly to set aside the fact of the deluge. For this purpose, the immense retrospective chronology of the Hindoos was eagerly caught at: and, when their literature was less known than it is at present, their total ignorance of the deluge was roundly asserted. Unfortunately for such objectors, when the matter was inquired into, it turned out, that the Hindoo tradition of the deluge was singularly full and exact, and that their retrospective chronology was merely a retrograde astronomical calculation largely interlarded with mythologic fables. Their cavils, however, have now received a final and decisive confutation

7. In point *probably* of systematic arrangement and *certainly* of liberal communicativeness,

from the labours of Mr. Cuvier. He shews most satisfactorily and at full length, both that *nature every where distinctly informs us that the commencement of the present order of things cannot be dated at a very remote period, and that mankind every where speak the same language with nature; whether we consult their national traditions on this subject, or consider their moral and political state and the intellectual attainments which they had made at the time when they began to have authentic historical monuments.* From a thorough review of the whole question, he at length draws the following inference: that, *if there is any circumstance thoroughly established in geology, it is, that the crust of our globe has been subjected to a great and sudden revolution, the epoch of which cannot be dated much farther back than five or six thousand years; that this revolution had buried all the countries, which were before inhabited by men and by the other animals that are now best known; that the small number of individuals of men and other animals, that escaped from the effects of that great revolution, have since propagated and spread over the lands then newly laid dry; and, consequently, that the human race has only resumed a progressive state of improvement since that epoch, by forming established societies, raising monuments, collecting natural facts, and constructing systems of science and of learning.* See Essay on the theory of the earth. § 32—35. p. 135—184.

I may be permitted to notice another curious remark of Mr. Cuvier, on account of its singular bearing upon the historical knowledge of the ancient Israelites.

He observes with much truth, that, among the pagan nations, wherever there was an hereditary priesthood, there was no authentic history, a tissue of wild legends occupying its place; and he accounts for the fact upon the rational principle of interested selfishness. *Of the sciences*, these he-

the ancients were very inferior to the moderns; for, whatever they *did* know, they delighted, as

reditary priests *would cultivate astronomy, which would give them credit as astrologers; mechanics, which would assist them in raising their monuments, those signs of their power and objects of the superstitious veneration of the people; geometry, the basis of astronomy as well as of mechanics, and an important auxiliary to agriculture in those vast plains of alluvion, which could not be drained and rendered fruitful but by the aid of numerous canals. They would encourage the mechanical or chemical arts, which would support their commerce and contribute to their luxury and the magnificence of their temples. But history, which informs men of their mutual relations, would be regarded by them with dread. What we see in India, we might therefore expect to find in general, wherever sacerdotal races, constituted like those of the Brahmens, and established in similar countries, assumed the same empire over the mass of the people. The same causes produce the same effects: and, in fact, we have only to glance over the fragments of the Egyptian and Chaldean traditions which have been preserved, to be convinced that these people had no more true history than the Indians.* Ibid. Supplem. p. 217, 218. Now, if *the same causes produce the same effects*, which they certainly will do unless prevented by some powerful counteraction, how are we to account for the remarkable fact, that the Israelites, who had an hereditary priesthood like the Hindoos or Egyptians, had nevertheless, and *that* too in their sacred books themselves, a regular prose history of their nation, advancing from age to age and from king to king, down from the very commencement of their national existence to the epoch of the Babylonian captivity? What was the powerful counteraction, which has produced, in despite of cause and effect, such a marked difference between the Israelites and all other nations distinguished by an hereditary priesthood? In the arts and sciences, enumerated by

much as possible, to confine to the schools of philosophy and to hide beneath the veil of mysterious secrecy: yet I strongly suspect, that their physiological knowledge was by no means so confined, as we may be apt to imagine.

Moses, we are told, *was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians*[1]: this wisdom is associated with *the wisdom of all the children of the east country*[2]: and the nature of this wisdom is clearly enough indicated to be, in a high degree, physiological[3]. To pretend to ascertain its amount would be idle and impertinent: yet, from a most curious passage in the old cosmogony of Chaldèa as preserved by Syncellus and Eusebius from Alexander-Polyhistor and Berosus, there is some reason to believe, that the philosophic Magi of Babylon were fully aware that many *genera* of animals had become extinct previous to the formation of man.

In the fantastic style of mythologic fabulizing which ancient science so much affected, their account of the origin of all things is put into the

Mr. Cuvier as objects of attention to such a priesthood, the Israelites were far behind the Hindoos and Egyptians: but they had a history as regular and exact in its circumstantial details, as the writings of Thucydides or Livy or Tacitus. There must needs be some *reason* for this marked difference: because otherwise, on the very just principle of Mr. Cuvier that *the same causes produce the same effects*, it is plain, that the difference could not have existed.

[1] Acts vii. 22. [2] 1 Kings iv. 30.

[3] 1 Kings iv. 32, 33.

mouth of the merman Oannes; who teaches his assembled auditors, that there was a time when the universe was darkness and water, in the midst of which resided various animals dissimilar in form to any of those which now exist. These mishapen creatures continued to live, until the hour of man's formation arrived. They were then annihilated; so that animals of such a description are no longer to be found in the present world. It is added by the authors, to whom we are indebted for the history of this remarkable cosmogony, that the figures of the annihilated animals were painted on the walls of the temple of Belus[1].

Now, though many of these figures, such as the centaurs for instance, were no doubt symbols or hieroglyphics; yet, when the whole legend is considered, it is difficult to account for its origin except on the supposition, that the Magi had gathered from fossil remains the fact that whole *genera* of animals have become extinct, that they had enriched their hieroglyphics by copying the forms of these remains upon the walls of the temple dedicated to the creative deity, and that (agreeably to the genius of ancient philosophy) they had disguised the whole matter in the dress of mythologic fiction. But, however this may be, the harmony, which

[1] Syncell. Chronog. p. 29. Euseb. Chron. p. 5.

has been found to subsist between the order of fossil strata and the Mosaic history of the creation, is truely wonderful: and it tends very greatly to increase our reverence for that extraordinary portion of God's inspired word.

CHAPTER IV.

THE OBJECT OF THE PATRIARCHAL DISPENSATION WAS TO INCULCATE THE DOCTRINE OF REDEMPTION.

THE singular theory of Bishop Warburton, which at one blow would annihilate the whole Patriarchal Dispensation, having now, perhaps with some reason, been discarded as untenable; since that Dispensation has been found to have a real existence, we may fitly proceed to inquire what was its special object.

Now the Patriarchal Dispensation was promulgated *after* the fall: and it continued in force, until the promulgation of the Law. Hence, as it was promulgated, for the first time, *after* the fall; we may be sure, that it had respect to some special point of doctrine, which the circumstance of the fall had rendered necessary. For, since Adam in his upright state could not but have been well acquainted with all spiritual matters which were essential to that condition; because, otherwise, he could not have rendered any acceptable service to God: it were plainly

superfluous, that after the fall a revelation should be vouchsafed to him, which yet taught him nothing beyond what he knew already. Common sense itself may shew, that, if it taught him any thing, it would teach him certain matters, which had become necessary to his new condition produced by the fall, and with which therefore the circumstance of the fall was most intimately associated.

On these grounds, we may venture to determine, that *from the history of the fall we must learn the object of the Patriarchal Dispensation.*

I. If the inquiry be first conducted *negatively*, the question will be greatly narrowed when we come next to conduct it *positively*.

1. The object then of the Patriarchal Dispensation could not be to convey the knowledge of the Divine Unity.

When Adam was placed in Paradise, the newly formed man was honoured by more than a single communication with his Maker; who seems, on these occasions, to have manifested himself by his Divine Word in a human figure [1].

Such being the case, it is clear that our first parents could not have been ignorant of the existence of one Supreme God, the creator and moderator of all things: for the awful Being, with whom they had actually conversed, claimed to himself this character both by his language

[1] Gen. ii. 16, 17, 19, 20, 22.

and by his deeds[1]. Hence the object of the Patriarchal Dispensation, which was promulgated *after* the fall, could not be to reveal the knowledge of the Divine Unity: because that knowledge was already possessed *before* the fall.

2. Neither could its special object be to inculcate authoritatively the duties of morality.

In these, we may reasonably conclude, that Adam must have been fully instructed during his Paradisiacal state: for, though a single positive command was made the test of his obedience or disobedience; *no one* (as it is well remarked by Bishop Warburton) *was ever so wild as to imagine, that, had Adam not eaten of the forbidden fruit, he would have been intitled to immortality, unless he had likewise observed the dictates of the moral law*[2].

3. Nor yet could its object be to teach the divine attributes of wisdom and power and justice.

The two former of these shone out too conspicuously in the works of the creation, whether intellectual or natural, to be overlooked and mistaken: and, as for the latter, it stood practically evinced by the several degrees of punishment which were inflicted upon the primeval transgressors[3].

[1] Gen. ii. 15—25. iii. 8—24.

[2] Div. Leg. book ix. chap. 1. p. 256, 257.

[3] Gen. iii. 14—19.

4. To sum up the whole in one word: its object could not be to communicate any knowledge, which man had already possessed during his abode in Paradise.

For to reveal what was *previously* known, either by the inductions of reason or by actual observation or by a prior communication from heaven, were plainly altogether nugatory and superfluous. At least, granting the possibility or (if we please) even the probability of an authoritative repetition of what had been previously known and enjoined; still the *special* object of the Patriarchal Dispensation must clearly be *to reveal something as yet unrevealed;* something, which the fall had rendered necessary to man, but which was unnecessary and therefore unknown *before* the fall.

II. This *negative* inquiry, by shutting out all which our first parents had learned during their Paradisiacal state, at once limits our *positive* inquiry to the history of the fall: for then it was, that man had need to acquire additional knowledge; then it was, that the Patriarchal Dispensation commenced.

1. Now it is obvious, that the only additional knowledge, which man had need to acquire after the fall, was *a knowledge which respected his miserably altered condition.*

Instead of basking in the sunshine of God's favour, as during the first period of his life; he found himself, deprived of his high privileges,

and subjected in a very marked manner to the divine displeasure. The only questions therefore, which were at all interesting to him under such circumstances, and which could form the subject of at least a *consolatory* revelation, was the important question; *whether he might hope to be ever reconciled to his offended Creator, and whether there was any prospect of his penalty being either remitted or mitigated.*

Hence I think it plain, that any dispensation of revealed religion, to which God might subject man after the fall, must have had for its special object the solution of this question. But, if it did not solve the question after a favourable manner, it could have had no other effect, than to drive man to absolute despair and thence (as our Church expresses it) to complete *wretchlessness of unclean living*. For, if it held out God as utter irreconcileable, there were of necessity a total end of hope and therefore a total want of any motive to repent. The object, consequently, of the Patriarchal Dispensation, to which man was subjected after the fall, must, if that Dispensation wore a benign aspect, have been *the inculcation of* (what in one word we call) *the doctrine of* REDEMPTION. But it is most certain, that the Patriarchal Dispensation *did* wear a benign aspect. Therefore *the inculcation of the doctrine of* REDEMPTION must have been its special object.

2. Agreeably to this conclusion from the very

necessity of the case, we find, that the Patriarchal Dispensation actually commences with a promise of REDEMPTION.

The Lord God said unto the serpent: I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed: he shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel[1].

In this prophecy, as we may gather from the Apocalypse, the woman stands as the federal representative of the Church; and her seed, in a large sense, denotes the whole body of the faithful[2]. But, as Christ is the first-born of many brethren, the Seed of the woman denotes specially and emphatically that mysterious Deliverer, who with a rod of iron should bruise the head of the infernal serpent, though in the conflict his heel or mortal part was destined to suffer.

Here then a promise of REDEMPTION and RECONCILIATION was held out to the first transgressors, and through them to all their posterity. But the knowledge of such a promise was the only additional knowledge essential to fallen man. Therefore we may be sure, that *to inculcate the doctrine of* REDEMPTION was the special object of the Patriarchal Dispensation.

[1] Gen. iii. 14, 15. [2] Rev. xii.

CHAPTER V.

RESPECTING THE KNOWLEDGE OF THE DOCTRINE OF REDEMPTION POSSESSED BY MANKIND DURING THE PATRIARCHAL AGES, SO FAR AS THE MATTER CAN BE ASCERTAINED FROM SCRIPTURE.

THE import of the first prophecy may be abundantly clear to *us*, who live under the full light of the Gospel, it will be said: but this does not prove it to have been equally clear, or even at all clear, to *Adam and his early descendants*. In other words, though the Patriarchal Dispensation may *inculcate* the doctrine of REDEMPTION; we must have some direct proof, that it was *understood* to inculcate it by those who lived during the patriarchal ages. For, unless such proof can be adduced, that Dispensation was assuredly, to the subjects of it, a mere dead letter. They would hold, it is true, in their hands *the instrument of pardon and reconciliation:* but this were of small benefit to them in a religious or moral point of view, if all the while they could neither *read* nor *understand* it.

Our next inquiry therefore must be, *whether the import of the promise made to our first parents was* AT ALL *understood by the early race of mortals;* and, if at all understood by them, TO WHAT EXTENT *it was understood.*

For a due solution of these two important questions, let us begin, as is most natural, with turning to Holy Scripture.

I. From the confessedly obscure and enigmatical terms, in which the prophecy itself is couched, some may be inclined to maintain, that *the first mortals could not have understood it* AT ALL; because they wanted that key to its meaning, which is furnished by the Christian Dispensation. I speak not here of scoffing infidels; with such, I have, at present, no concern: I speak rather of serious inquirers after the truth, who soberly and rationally wish to see it investigated. Now it is undeniable, that many persons of this description may doubt whether the first prophecy could be AT ALL intelligible to Adam and his earlier descendants.

1. That such a difficulty may be ftly solved, let us open the matter with observing the sufficiently obvious nature and intention of the prophecy respecting the Seed of the woman.

Man had recently fallen through disobedience: and the prophecy before us was delivered to him, at his first interview with his Maker subsequent to his apostasy. Hence it wears a very peculiar character. It is not a mere insulated

and detached prediction, which might have been delivered at one time just as well as at another: but it bears immediately and directly upon the circumstances of the fall. While the agent of temptation is irrecoverably doomed to a low and abject condition, the Seed of the injured woman is successfully to bruise his head, though in the conflict the serpent should bruise his heel. Nor is it only, that the prophecy stands immediately connected with the fall of our first parents: it is plainly no other than the inaugural discourse of that system of revealed religion, to which henceforth they were to be subject; it is plainly, as we now understand its meaning, the very corner-stone of that only Dispensation which could be suitable to the wants of lost mankind.

Now, if it were wholly unintelligible to Adam and Eve and their posterity after them, where was the utility of its being delivered to them?

A Dispensation, teaching the doctrine of REDEMPTION, was the only Dispensation that could be suitable to their wants. The Patriarchal Dispensation, through the medium of the first delivered prophecy, actually teaches this identical doctrine. But, if the medium through which the doctrine was taught still remained wholly unintelligible to the early race of mortals, we shall be brought to the strangely irrational conclusion; that they were placed under a Dispensation, respecting the purport of which

they were yet left in a state of entire ignorance: a conclusion much the same in point of wisdom, as if, some thousands of years hence, a generation of speculatists should arise, who would deny to the primitive Christians and to us their successors all insight into the nature and purpose of the Evangelical Dispensation.

Agreeably, therefore, to such a conclusion as *this*, the Patriarchal Dispensation must, in a religious point of view, have been altogether useless to those for whose benefit it was promulged. Their worship could have had no solid basis to rest upon: for wherefore should a fallen race labour to propitiate the Deity, if not the slightest intelligible hope of pardon and reconciliation had been held out to them? The Dispensation itself, whatever valuable offers it might contain, would plainly be a mere dead letter, from which not the slightest improvement or advantage could be extracted, if those offers were couched in terms so dark and obscure that they could not possibly be understood by the persons to whom they were addressed. But God is a Spirit, and must be worshipped in spirit and in truth: God is all-wise, and therefore, never acts in vain. As well might we conclude, that some deeply learned physician would write a prescription of sovereign efficacy in a language wholly unintelligible both to the patient and to the pharmacopolist; that an European practitioner, for instance, would employ

the tongue of China to convey the knowledge of his health-dispensing medicines: as that God would place fallen man under a system of revealed religion, which was exactly indeed *suited* to his wants and which *possessed* a full capability of working a moral cure, but which was rendered quite useless to him by his *total ignorance* of its import and design.

Hence the very reason of the thing requires us to suppose, that man understood the drift and object of the first promise, so far as was necessary for every saving purpose.

2. This, accordingly, is admitted by Bishop Warburton; even though he contends, that man was left in the most profound ignorance as to any future state of retribution: at least it is admitted by his lordship, that the promise must have been understood to mean, that our fallen race should, through the divine assistance, ultimately triumph over their infernal enemy. *What then*, he asks, *did the Jews*, and therefore of course their predecessors during the patriarchal ages, *understand by it? This certainly, and nothing but this: that the evil spirit, who actuated the serpent, would continue his enmity to the human race; but that man, by the divine assistance, should be at length enabled to defeat all his machinations*[1].

On such a concession I may remark again, as

[1] Div. Leg. book vi. sect. 3. p. 387.

I have already remarked above, that it involves a virtual acknowledgment of *Adam's acquaintance with the doctrine of* REDEMPTION, the inculcating of which I have shewn to be the special object of the Patriarchal Dispensation. Whether he knew, or did not know, *the precise mode* in which his redemption was to be effected, is of no concern in the present question. Even if he were most completely ignorant of *the manner;* provided only he was made acquainted with *the doctrine itself,* his religion would have a sufficient basis to rest upon. He would understand, quite enough for all moral purposes, the grand object of the Dispensation under which he was placed. For, the black mists of despair having been rolled away from before the mercy-seat, he would be taught to hope that a reconciliation with God might still be effected.

That the whole of this stands involved in the bishop's concession, whether he might have been willing to allow it or not, is, I think, abundantly manifest.

If Adam, viewed as possessing plain common sense instead of being so portentously stupid as modern infidels would make him, must, agreeably to his lordship's very just remark, have understood the promise to mean; that *man, by the divine assistance, should be at length enabled to defeat all the machinations of that evil being who spoke through the organs of the serpent:* he must also have concluded, that the loss, which he

had sustained, should be repaired; and that he, and all his posterity, should ultimately, by whatever means, be restored to the favour of heaven. For, if the Seed of the woman was to defeat *all* the machinations of the evil one (a matter, figuratively indeed, but very intelligibly, expressed by the bruising of the serpent's *head*): then was he likewise to defeat that *first* and *most eminent* machination of Satan, which alienated man from his Creator, and which drew down upon him the sentence of death. And, if *the divine assistance*, in some shape or other, was clearly implied in the gaining of this promised victory (for Adam could not but perceive, that victory was altogether impossible *without* the divine assistance); then the very grant of such assistance was an evident proof, that God had not wholly cast off his creature man, that he still entertained benevolent sentiments toward him, and that he was ready and willing to coöperate in the work of reconciliation. But experience would soon teach mankind, that the victory, described under the image of *bruising the serpent's head*, did not extend so far as to annul the sentence of corporeal death or the dissolution of the soul and the body. To what then did it, or could it, extend; if not to the annulling of that part of the sentence, which respected the final destination of the soul? For, if it had *no* operation upon the sentence in *any* shape; if the sentence, notwithstanding the promised

victory over the serpent, still remained in *full* force: it were difficult, either for Adam or for any other person to have comprehended, how *a victory*, in the proper sense of the word, could *at all* be gained. So far from this being the case, on the supposition that the original sentence continued *wholly unaltered and unrepealed*, the infernal serpent must evidently have come out of the contest with the woman's Seed, not *vanquished* but *himself victorious:* for, instead of *man, by the divine assistance, having been at length enabled to defeat all his machinations* (to adopt the language employed by Bishop Warburton); all his machinations would clearly have been attended with as complete success, as his utmost malignity could have desired. He would have procured for man a sentence of condemnation: and that sentence of condemnation, whatever partial foils he might experience in the predicted struggle, would remain entire and in full force. But, in truth, no mere *partial* foils could ever be understood from the expression, that *the serpent's* HEAD *should be bruised.* The very expression, as the bishop rightly judged, announces A COMPLETE VICTORY *over* ALL *his machinations.* Hence, whether, by that part of the sentence which respected the soul, Adam understood *its annihilation,* or *its continued existence in a state of punishment:* when once it was found, that the body remained liable to death notwithstanding the promised victory over the serpent; it must

have been concluded, unless we deny to primeval man all faculty of reasoning, that the victory would consist in a procuring the repeal of that part of the sentence, which respected the future destination of the soul. But such an insight as this into the purport of the first prophecy is, to all intents and purposes, a knowledge of the doctrine of REDEMPTION. Even if the early race of mortals had known nothing more: still, if they knew, as they clearly must have known, that the Seed of the woman should effectually and completely bruise the head of the serpent or in the end altogether defeat his machinations; they could not but have been acquainted with *the naked fact* of A PROMISED REDEMPTION AND RESTORATION, however ignorant they might be of *the precise mode* in which it should be effected.

Thus, on the very principles of Bishop Warburton himself, who will not be suspected of allowing to our first parents a deeper insight into the sense of the prophecy than he could possibly avoid (for he actually ascribes to the early mortals the preceding interpretation of it, rather than that gross literal exposition which modern infidels would fain put into their mouth, on the avowed ground of proving that they could not deduce from it any knowledge of a future state): on these very principles I have shewn, that they must have deduced from it the naked fact of A PROMISED REDEMPTION AND

RESTORATION, in which (as the bishop himself allows) the knowledge of the soul's immortality in happiness is of necessity involved[1].

II. We have now answered affirmatively the important question, *whether the drift of the first prophecy was* AT ALL *understood by the early race of mortals:* the next question is, TO WHAT EXTENT *they understood it.*

Bishop Warburton remarks, that, *to enable them to understand by the latter part of the sentence, that* MAN SHOULD BE RESTORED TO HIS LOST INHERITANCE OF IMMORTALITY BY THE SACRIFICE OF CHRIST ON THE CROSS *needed an express revelation of this mystery*[2].

I readily concede to his lordship, that, without some explanatory revelation, they must, to say the very least of it, have been greatly in the dark as to THE MODE in which this restoration was to be effected: but I have already shewn, even on his own principles, that it required no further revelation to make them acquainted with *the naked fact* of THE RESTORATION ITSELF. All therefore, that I am at present concerned with, is THE EXTENT to which they knew THE PRECISE MODE.

Now, if upon investigation it should turn out that they were by no means ignorant even of THE PRECISE MODE, though of course they

[1] Div. Leg. book v. sect. 6. p. 195.

[2] Div. Leg. book vi. sect. 3. p. 386.

could not have known it like ourselves *in every minute particular* (for *that* were to invert the order and purpose of divine prophecy, which is never *fully* explained save by the event): we *must*, I should conceive, infer from such a fact; that, under some form or other, an explanatory revelation was vouchsafed to our first parents, in order that they might derive from the Dispensation under which they were placed its full comfort and benefit. For, if such a fact can be established by sufficient evidence, it is hard to say, how we can quite satisfactorily account for it, except by the hypothesis of an explanatory revelation. Water cannot rise above the spring-head: and an *accurate*, however *imperfect*, knowledge of an arbitrary doctrine cannot have mounted higher than an antecedent communication of it.

Yet, since some important deductions might assuredly have been made from the mere terms of the prophecy itself, even without any additional explanatory revelation; it will perhaps be the most satisfactory mode of prosecuting the inquiry, to trace the probable workings of the human mind, until we reach the point which it could not pass without the aid of a divine instructor.

1. The primary question, that would present itself to our first parents after the fall, would obviously respect the nature of that serpent

who had so maliciously seduced them into disobedience.

Now, when we consider the power and subtilty of the infernal tempter as known to ourselves, it is incredible, that Adam and Eve should have been placed in a state of probation upon which so much depended, without being duly warned of the nature and machinations of their spiritual enemy. Hence, when they perceived the lamentable effects of their transgression, they would forthwith conclude (they must have been destitute of common sense, if they did *not* conclude), that their seducer was no mere serpent, but their malignant foe lurking under the form and using the organs of that animal. They would readily observe indeed, that the prophecy was adapted to the peculiarity of the serpentine form: but, as they would be unable to receive any great consolation from interpreting it *literally;* as it were but sorry comfort for the loss of immortality to be assured, that, although snakes would be apt to fix their poisonous teeth in the heels of men, yet men would revenge themselves by bruising the heads of such reptiles; they would naturally, even without any further communication from heaven, incline to a *figurative* exposition, and would conclude that the promise related to some extraordinary contest between a son of the woman and the spiritual enemy who had tempted them

to disobedience. This, as we have seen, by the concession of Bishop Warburton himself, they would obviously infer: but still, where so much was at stake and where their best interests were so deeply concerned, they would be anxious to know the specific meaning of the remarkable terms in which the prophecy was conveyed.

If we suppose them to have been ignorant before the fall of the poisonous nature of the serpent's bite, they would very soon become acquainted with it after the fall. Hence, from the mere terms of the oracle, and without any further instruction from heaven, they would conclude, that the son of the woman was destined to experience the death of the body in the course of his conflict with their enemy: though, at the same time, they would likewise conclude, that the power of their enemy would be as effectually crushed by their triumphant woman-born Deliverer, as the deleterious potency of the serpent is annihilated by crushing his head. They would conclude therefore, that a complete rescue would be effected for them, and that a perfect victory would be obtained over their foe, so that he should effectually be deprived of the means of doing mischief; yet that this victory would not be obtained, save through the death of the victor.

2. An inquiry would next occur, as to the nature of this mighty Conqueror, and as to the

reason of his being so peculiarly denominated *the Seed of the woman*.

(1.) Whether, or no, the minds of Adam and Eve were enlightened by any express revelation on the subject; an occurrence stands recorded, which might well lead to a probable *conjecture* at least, even if they had received no further information from above.

We are told, that, after the fall, the man and his wife HEARD *the Voice of the Lord God* WALKING *in the garden*, and that *they hid themselves from* THE PRESENCE *of the Lord God amongst the trees*[1]. Soon, however, they were compelled to come forth from their lurking place: and then it was, that, while passing their different sentences upon the several offenders, the Supreme Being could not but be observed by our first parents, as sustaining the character of an open and decided enemy to the serpent; while he appeared, even in the midst of justice, as being the compassionate friend of themselves. For, the conference being ended, instead of turning them adrift without deigning to vouchsafe the slightest mark of pity and good will, we are informed, that *the Lord God*, ere he departed from them, *did* MAKE *unto Adam and to his wife coats of skins, and clothed them* with these vestments of HIS OWN WORKMANSHIP[2].

[1] Gen. iii. 8. [2] Gen. iii. 21.

The account is remarkable, both as forming a contrast with the more austere treatment of the seducer, and as containing certain very extraordinary expressions.

A visible manifestation of Jehovah, under some aspect or other, stands here expressly recorded. Now we are assured by St. John, that *no man hath seen God* the Father *at any time*; but that *the only-begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father*, and who is most unequivocally identified with the man Jesus Christ, *he hath declared him*[1]. The person therefore, who was visibly manifested to Adam and Eve, could not have been God the Father: and, as we are taught that it is the special office of the Son or the Divine Word to *declare him*, and as that Son in the discharge of his office was visibly and permanently manifested in the world; we seem almost of necessity obliged to conclude, that the person who visibly manifested himself to Adam and Eve, was the Son or Divine Word.

With this conclusion, accordingly, the peculiar phraseology adopted by Moses exactly agrees. He tells us, that the man and his wife, *heard* THE VOICE *of the Lord God walking in the garden*. Now, respecting this passage, it is justly insisted by the Rabbins, that the participle *walking* agrees with *the Voice* and not with *the Lord God*: and an inspection of the original

[1] John i. 18.

will at once convince any Hebraist, that such is the natural and obvious construction of the sentence[1]. What they heard then walking in the garden was a divine person styled *The Voice of Jehovah:* and there can be little doubt, I think, that this *Voice of Jehovah* is the same being as *The Word of Jehovah,* well known to the ancient Targumists by the appellation of *Mimra* or *Dabar,* and celebrated by Isaiah under the kindred title of *The Name of Jehovah*[2].

(2.) Thus it appears, that the person, who visibly manifested himself to Adam and Eve, was the Voice or Word or Name of the Lord: not God the Father, for him hath no man seen at any time; but, agreeably to the economy of grace, God the Son, through whom, as by the agency of a voice or word, the Father has alone

[1] This is the sense, in which the passage is explained by the Targumists: for they agree to render it, *They heard the Word of the Lord God walking;* and the Jerusalem Targum paraphrases the beginning of the next verse, *The Word of the Lord called unto Adam.* The Word therefore, that called, was the Word or Voice that walked; agreeably to the very just judgment of the Jewish commentators, who cannot be said to have any of (what the Socinians would call) the *prejudices* of the Triunitarians. *Vox enim est res illa, de qua dicitur, quod ambulaverit in horto.* Maimon. Mor. Nevoch. par. i. c. 24. See also Tzeror Hammor. sect. Bereshith. apud Owen. Exerc. x. in Heb. vi. 1.

[2] See Isaiah xxx. 27. The prophet also, precisely like Moses, calls this being *The Voice of Jehovah.* See ver. 30, 31.

been pleased to reveal himself to his creatures. The question therefore now is, under what form this divine being appeared to our first parents.

If we advert to other parts of the Hebrew Scriptures, we shall find frequent mention of a personage, who on various occasions reveals himself to the ancient people of God, and who is ordinarily styled *The Angel* or *Messenger of Jehovah.* Now we are not to imagine, that this being is a mere created angel, according to the sense in which we are accustomed familiarly to use the term *angel:* so far from it, he both is declared to be the Supreme Being himself, and he receives in that capacity as his just right divine worship. But the character, thus denominated, is always said to appear under the human figure: and, though in outward fashion as a man, the old Israelites and the patriarchs before them constantly acknowledge him to be God, and venerate him accordingly.

This curious subject I have already discussed so much at large, that it were superfluous here to resume it[1]. Yet it may be proper to remark, by way of cutting off all occasion of dispute, that the human figure, which was thus exhibited, was no mere aërial phantom, but a substantial body provided with the very same organs as our own bodies. The MAN-JEHOVAH, who conversed with Abraham, suffered his feet

[1] See Horæ Mosaic. book ii. sect. i. chap. 2.

to be washed by that patriarch, and literally eat of the butter and the milk and the calf which were set before him[1]: the MAN-JEHOVAH, who wrestled with Jacob, was alike visible to the sight and palpable to the touch[2]. Agreeably to the nature of such manifestations, Malachi foretold, that the Lord, even the Messenger of the covenant, should suddenly come to his own temple at Jerusalem[3]: and this prophecy was doubtless fulfilled, when the Word of God, literally made flesh, *came unto his own, and his own received him not*[4]. Now, according to Malachi, the Messenger of the covenant, or the Word of God, came unto HIS OWN temple. But the temple, to which he came, was doubtless the temple of Jehovah. Therefore this Messenger of the covenant, notwithstanding he is *sent* by a distinct person of the Deity, as the very term *Messenger* of necessity implies, and as our Lord repeatedly asserts respecting his own economic character, must needs be Jehovah his very self. The Messenger of the covenant, however, is certainly Jesus Christ; whom St. John accordingly, in strict agreement with the necessary deduction from the language of Malachi, pronounces to be both very God and the Word of God. But the apostle equally declares, that he was literally *made* FLESH: while

[1] Gen. xviii.
[2] Gen. xxxii. 24—30.
[3] Malach. iii. 1.
[4] John i. 1, 11, 14.

another apostle similarly teaches us, that he was *found in fashion as* A MAN[1]. Hence, when the Word of God was permanently manifested among us, he still appeared, as of old, in a human form. Nor was his permanent body, any more than his temporary body, an airy and impalpable phantom, as some of the Gnostics and Docetæ fondly contended. During his abode upon earth, his solid assumed body in all things resembled our bodies. He eat: he drank: he endured both the touch of friendship and the gripe of enmity. Neither, in the day of his glorification, did his raised body cease to be material. By actual contact, and by visibly eating in their presence, he convinced his wondering disciples, that he was no spectre, as their fears had led them to imagine; though he possessed the power, a power closely resembling that which he exerted at his several ancient corporeal appearances under the Patriarchal and Levitical Dispensations, of suddenly transporting his body, tangible as it was, from one place to another.

We find therefore, that, as God the Father has never been seen by any man, but that he economically declares his high behests through the medium of his Son or his Word or his Voice or his Messenger: so that divine person, whether he *occasionally* manifested himself to the

[1] Philip. ii. 8.

Patriarchal and Levitical Churches or *permanently* to the infant Christian Church, still invariably appeared in the form of a substantial and tangible MAN. Under the several Dispensations, there was no difference in *the figure* of the vehicle: the difference was, not in *the mode*, but in *the duration*, of the appearance. From first to last, whenever his visible form is specifically mentioned, it is always declared to be the HUMAN.

And now we shall have some clue as to the form, in which Jehovah appeared to our first parents.

We have learned on the authority of St. John, that no man hath ever seen God the Father. But the God, who appeared to our first parents, *was* seen by man. Therefore that divine person could not have been God the Father. But, if he was not God the Father, he must have been God the Word; who, as the same apostle teaches us, was *made* FLESH, and whose economical office it is to *declare* the Father: whence indeed, as I have already noted, he most probably received his descriptive title of *the Word* or *the Voice* or *the Oracle of Jehovah*. Moses accordingly states, as the Rabbins acknowledge his phraseology ought to be understood, that the person, who appeared to Adam and Eve, was *the* VOICE *of the Lord God*. Now this VOICE, when he deigned to converse visibly with our fallen race, under the old Dispensa-

tions *repeatedly*, and under the new Dispensation *permanently*, failed not to reveal himself in the form of A MAN. Analogy therefore, even if we had nothing beyond analogy, might well sanction the inference, that he similarly appeared to our first parents in the HUMAN form. But, if I mistake not, such an opinion is warranted by something more than analogy: it seems almost inevitably to flow from the peculiar language employed by the sacred historian in detailing the circumstances of this remarkable transaction.

Adam and Eve are first said to have HEARD the Voice of Jehovah WALKING in the garden. Afterwards Jehovah is represented, as personally MAKING coats of skins, and as himself CLOTHING them[1]. And lastly, by way of shewing that the person, who was thus *heard walking* and who was *seen in the act of making coats of skins*, was a distinct essence from the *invisible* Jehovah, from that Jehovah whom St. John declares to have been never beheld by mortal eyes; lastly, Moses sets forth a most extraordinary conference, between what can only be esteemed certain distinct existences in the divine nature of the ONE JEHOVAH: *The Lord God said, Behold the man is become as* ONE OF US, *to know good and evil; and now let him not put*

[1] Gen. iii. 8, 21.

forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever[1].

Now the terms HEARD, and WALKING, and MAKING, and CLOTHING, all imply the presence of A REAL HUMAN BODY: the footsteps of which were distinctly heard by Adam and Eve, just as they might mutually hear their own footsteps; and the operative labours of which were distinctly beheld by them, just as they might mutually behold their own operative labours. Accordingly, when, in a subsequent part of the Mosaical history, Jehovah, attended by two ministering angels, is expressly said to have appeared to Abraham in the form of A MAN: the very same Hebrew word is employed to describe the act of his departure from that patriarch, as that which is here employed to describe his approach. In the one place, Jehovah, with evident reference to the form which he had assumed, is stated to have WALKED AWAY: in the other place, with a similar reference (as I conjecture), he is stated to have been heard WALKING in the garden[2].

That this divine character however, who visibly appeared to our first parents, is distinct from certain other divine characters, who did not visibly appear to them, though all these

[1] Gen. iii. 22.

[2] Compare in the Heb. Gen. xviii. 33. with iii. 8.

characters jointly constitute only ONE JEHOVAH; is clearly set forth by Moses in the account which he gives of the conference held between them subsequent to the fall: *man is become as* ONE OF US. Such phraseology not only implies a plurality of essences in the Godhead, but a plurality greater than a dual: for the expression ONE OF US seems most naturally to denote a larger number than *two*. Agreeably to this inference we elsewhere find, both in the Old and in the New Testament, a third divine essence mentioned under the appellation of *the Holy Spirit*, or *the Spirit of Jehovah*. Thus does the Deity stand confessed in three distinct subsistences; which, for want of a more appropriate name, we are accustomed to denominate *persons*: the unseen Jehovah, or God the Father; the seen Jehovah, or God the Son, who of old repeatedly and who once permanently manifested himself in a human form; and the vivifying Jehovah, or God the Holy Ghost, who is the Spirit equally of the other two[1].

(3.) The Voice then or Word of Jehovah appeared to our first parents under the figure of a man: and, when he thus appeared, he not only displayed himself as the avowed adversary of the infernal serpent, but he likewise exercised over him all the conspicuous superiority of a conqueror; not only exercised over him the

[1] See 2 Corinth. iii. 6.

conscious superiority of a conqueror, but likewise instituted a most significant yet (abstractedly speaking) a most extraordinary rite.

We are told, that with his own hands he made coats of skins for Adam and Eve, with which he clothed them to hide the shame both of their physical and of their moral nakedness.

Now these skins must have been taken from certain animals, which had been previously slaughtered, either by the immediate agency of the divine anthropomorphic Word himself, or by the man and his wife receiving from the Word a command to perform that action. For what purpose then were they so slaughtered? They could not have been slain merely for the sake of their skins: because Adam and Eve might have been supplied with sufficient covering from the hair and the wool. Neither could they have been slain for food: because as yet the grant of animal food had not been made. But, if they were slain for the sake neither of food nor of raiment, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion, that they were slain for sacrifice, and therefore that the rite of sacrifice was at that precise time first instituted: a conclusion rendered the more probable from the shortly following circumstance of Abel devoting a victim, as if in consequence of some positive institution[1]. It is hard however to believe, that

[1] I have stated this argument in a somewhat different manner from the excellent Archbishop Magee. *That the beasts,*

such a rite would have been instituted after a mere arbitrary manner and without any explanatory reason being assigned for its institution: and this belief is rendered yet more impracticable by the curious and striking fact, that the identical notion, which both the Israelites and

whose skins were allotted for covering to our first parents, had been slain, is natural to suppose: as it is not reasonable to think, that any animals had died of themselves, so soon after their creation, and without having yet experienced any severity of climate or situation. Now there were no purposes, for which they could have been slain, unless those of food, sacrifice, or covering. That they were not slain for food, has been sufficiently established. Neither can it be admitted, that they were slain merely for covering: since it cannot be supposed, that Adam would, immediately after the sentence of the divine displeasure, have dared to kill God's creatures without his permission; nor is it likely, that God should order them to be slain solely for their skins, when man could have been supplied with sufficient covering from the hair and the wool. It follows then, that they had been slain with a view to sacrifice. This alone supplies an adequate reason. Disc. on atonement and sacrifice. Numb. LXIV. vol. ii. p. 230, 231. The defective point in the present statement is the supposition, that the animals had been *recently* created, and that as yet they could scarcely have died of themselves. Now the fact is, that whole *genera* of animals must not only have died individually, but must have become totally extinct, anterior even to the very creation of man. The animals therefore in question certainly *might* have died a natural death: but such an opinion is highly improbable; for there is something revolting and abhorrent in the idea, that the skins of animals, thus defunct and thence either putrid or approaching to putridity, should be employed for the purpose of raiment. See above book i. chap. 3. § IV.

the Pagans in all parts of the world entertained respecting the purport and efficacy of bloody sacrifices, is declared by the inspired writers of the New Testament to be the true one. Every bloody sacrifice was universally supposed to be of an expiatory or piacular nature; the victim, being deemed the substitute of the offerer, and being thought to bear the wrath of the offended gods transferred from him to itself. As this opinion then is declared by the evangelical writers to be the true one; so *the universality* of its prevalence, long before the advent of our Saviour, can only be accounted for on the supposition, that all nations received it from some common source: for, the opinion being of an *arbitrary* description, it could not have been thus *universally* adopted, unless all nations had been indebted to a common primeval interpretation of the ordinance. But we are assured by the inspired writers, that this very interpretation is the true one: and we know, that the only common source, whence all nations could have derived it, is primarily Noah after the deluge and ultimately Adam after the fall. Noah therefore after the deluge, and Adam after the fall, must have been acquainted with the true interpretation of the ordinance. But it is difficult to imagine, how Adam in the first instance, or Noah in the second, could have stumbled upon that identical interpretation which is declared to be the true one, if the

rite had been arbitrarily instituted without any exposition being given of its nature and purport. Hence we seem compelled to infer, that the precise interpretation, authoritatively declared many ages afterwards to be the true one, was given to our first parents ere they were excluded from Paradise, and by them was duly handed down to their universal posterity.

But, if the true interpretation of the rite was given to Adam and Eve (and, if it were *not*, we shall have to account for the extraordinary fact, that this true interpretation was known in every quarter of the globe, ages before it was authoritatively recognized in the Gospel): if, I say, the true interpretation of the rite was given to Adam and Eve; then they could not but have been informed, that the slaughter of the victims shadowed out the future slaughter of the woman's Seed which was enigmatically foretold under the imagery of his heel or mortal part being bruised by the serpent's tooth, and that the veiling of their physical nakedness with the skins of the slain animals represented the veiling of their moral nakedness with the ascriptive meritoriousness of the murdered woman-born. In learning this part however of the grand scheme of grace, they must have either learned or inferred the other part. They would perceive, that the future death of the woman's Seed brought about in some undefined manner by the agency of their invisible enemy, corres-

ponded with the bruising of his heel by the tooth of the serpent: but then they would likewise perceive, that an ultimate victory, achieved by the woman's Seed over the same invisible enemy, must of necessity be supposed; otherwise, there would be nothing to correspond with that portion of the prophecy, which respects the bruising of the serpent's head by the Seed of the woman. On these grounds, they must, I think, have learned, that, as the death of the victims on their behalf shadowed out the piacular death of the woman-born; so the woman-born was destined, notwithstanding his death, to achieve so complete a victory over their malignant seducer, that his power should be effectually crushed, and that they themselves with their remote posterity after them should be restored to the enjoyment of the divine favour.

(4.) And now, supposing nothing more to have been revealed than the typically piacular nature of animal sacrifice, what ideas could they entertain of the extraordinary person, who was to suffer and accomplish such things?

They would plainly discern, that his power, whether inherent or communicated, was far superior to any power which *they* possessed. That he was to be A MAN indeed, they could not doubt; for he was both to be born of woman, and was to taste the very death which had just been denounced on themselves: but what KIND of man was he to be? Like the GOD-MAN, who

stood before their eyes, he was to be distinguished by a power far surpassing their own: like the same GOD-MAN, he was to be a literal and proper human being: and, still like the same GOD-MAN, he both was to be a determined foe to the serpent, and was to exercise over it the identical victorious controul which they beheld the apparent Voice of Jehovah actually exercise over it in their very presence. Could then the mysterious predicted Seed of the woman be the GOD-MAN himself?

We are not positively told, whether this obvious question was ever answered in the affirmative: but I am inclined to conjecture that it *was*, from the remarkable ejaculation of Eve on the birth of her eldest son Cain.

Eve, not knowing the precise time when the promised Seed was to appear, and doubtless very impatiently expecting his manifestation exclaimed we are told, on the birth of her first son: *I have gotten* THE MAN, *even* JEHOVAH HIS VERY SELF[1]. From this language (for such is the literal rendering of the original), she seems evidently to have imagined, that the promised Seed was *then* born into the world[2]. But, if

[1] Gen. iv. 1.

[2] Such, as I have elsewhere observed, is the sense in which the old Paraphrast understands this singular passage. *And Adam knew his wife Eve, who desired the Angel: and she conceived, and bare Cain: and she said, I have obtained the Man, the Angel of Jehovah.* Such too is undoubtedly the force

such were her opinion; then, for some reason or other, she must have believed, that the predicted MAN would also be JEHOVAH HIMSELF.

Now it is not easy to conceive, how she came to use this singular language, if she had merely *conjectured* that the promised Seed *might possibly* be the Voice of Jehovah who had revealed himself to her and to her husband under the form of A MAN. The words import a degree of *positiveness*, which could only have been the result of some special explanatory revelation. Neither was it at all unnatural for her to imagine, that she *herself* was to be the mother of the promised Seed: the terms of the prophecy,

of the original Hebrew. The particle אֵת, as it is well known, imports *the very substance of any thing*, and is nearly equivalent to the Latin pronoun *Ipse*. There is no word in the sacred text answering to the preposition *From*, which our translators, imitating the Greek of the LXX, have injudiciously and gratuitously inserted. To express the sense which *they* ascribe to the Hebrew, אֵת should have been written מֵאֵת, that is *ab ipso*; as in Deut. xviii. 3. and in Zechar. xiv. 7. It is well remarked by Aben-Ezra, *sensus vocis* אֵת *est quasi substantia rei.* Hottinger. Hist. Creat. quæst. xiii. Thus אֶתְהָ is *Thou* or *Thy substance:* אִתִּי is *Me* or *My substance*, Lat. *Meipsum:* אִתּוֹ is *Him* or *His substance.* Whence מֵאִתִּי is *From me* or *From my substance*, and so forth. From this proper sense of *substantiality*, the word sometimes acquires the sense of *With;* because that preposition involves the leading idea of the term. But such a mode of speech, if I mistake not, is really elliptical. The word אֵת itself is truly a noun substantive, as Aben-Ezra justly remarks.

without a chronological exposition, would plainly, according to the first construction, lead to such an opinion. She seems then to have been informed as to the *character* of the predicted Deliverer, though nothing definite was revealed to her as to the *time* when he should appear.

But the very phraseology of the promise might have led her to expect something extraordinary, not only in the *character* of the Deliverer, but likewise in *the mode of his birth*. It is not said, that he was to be the seed of *the man:* he is foretold, as the Seed of *the woman.* If any explanation of this phrase was given to Eve, she certainly in the height of her impatience overlooked it: for, though Cain might rightly be denominated HER *seed*, he was not HER *seed* EXCLUSIVELY.

3. From what has been said, it will easily be perceived, that I suppose the explanatory revelation to have been given when the typical ordinance of sacrifice was first instituted: and the steps, by which I arrive at this supposition, are the following.

(1.) The notion of *vicarious piacularity*, associated with the oblation of an animal victim, is plainly altogether *arbitrary*, not *obvious* or *natural*. But it is impossible to account for *the universal prevalence* of an *arbitrary* notion, except on the hypothesis of derivation from a common source.

The *arbitrary* notion however of *vicarious piacularity*, associated with the oblation of an animal victim, has been of *universal prevalence* from the earliest ages of which we have any record. Therefore all those, who have held this *arbitrary* notion, must have received it from a common source.

If then they received it from a common source; the earliness of their dispersion from Babel, and their subsequent want of mutual intercourse except in the case of those who were near neighbours to each other, will compel us to look for that source in a period *anterior* to the dispersion. But, if we be required to seek it in a period *anterior* to the dispersion from Babel, we are obviously brought to Noah, as the second great father of mankind, and as the fountain of all their sound religious knowledge.

Yet even Noah was not the first sacrificer: we have a previous account of a remarkable oblation offered up by Cain and Abel; which was characterized by a marked distinction, on the part of God himself, between a mere vegetable eucharistic donation, and an apparently piacular animal victim. Nor can we stop short with the oblation of the two brethren: it is impossible to account rationally for the production of those skins, with which Jehovah clothed our first parents, except by supposing them to have been

procured from animals then offered up in sacrifice; for, as yet, no grant had been made of animal food.

Thus are we finally brought to Adam himself for the earliest institution and oblation of sacrifice: and since the *arbitrary* notion of its *vicarious piacularity* has been traced up to Noah, we must trace the same notion yet higher up to Adam; unless indeed we be content to suppose, without a shadow either of proof or of probability, that it was first excogitated by Noah. But, if this *arbitrary* notion must be traced up to Noah and to Adam: then, of course, both Noah and Adam must alike have entertained it; for they could not communicate to their descendants what they did not hold themselves.

The notion however, wholly *arbitrary* as it is, proves to be no other than the *true* notion: for we learn from the inspired writers of the New Testament, not only that animal-sacrifices were indeed to be esteemed *vicariously piacular*, but likewise that they were all types or shadows of the great piacular sacrifice of Christ.

Whence then did this *true*, though *arbitrary*, notion originate in the first instance? We have traced it up to Adam through Noah: we are compelled therefore to conclude, either that it was an unauthorized speculation of Adam, or that it was authoritatively communicated to him by divine revelation.

If we decide in favour of the first part of the

alternative, we must ascribe to Adam a most extraordinary faculty of guessing aright: and still, when we have done so, we must exhibit himself and every pious individual of his posterity, down to the time of Moses when the ancient ordinance of sacrifice was divinely recognized and engrafted into the Levitical Dispensation, as superstitiously and foolishly devoted to what in *their* case could have been no better than an act of mere gratuitous will-worship; for, though the notion happened to be *right*, yet, since it was accidentally hit upon and not authoritatively declared, it plainly could have held no higher rank in a religious point of view than that which has here been ascribed to it. Nor is this all: we must likewise account for the difference which God made between the vegetable-offering of Cain and the animal-sacrifice of Abel. Now, as I have already observed, it is impossible to account for this difference on the mere score of any antecedent diversity in the moral characters of the two brethren: as if the offering of Cain were rejected, simply because he was a bad man; while the sacrifice of Abel was accepted, simply because he was a good man. Had such been the true reason, God would doubtless have assigned it, that so Cain might be moved to speedy repentance and reformation. But, instead of any thing being said on *this* sufficiently obvious topic, Cain is told: that, if he can indeed claim to be free

from sin, not his *offering* (as we might have expected the answer to run), but *himself* shall be accepted; while, on the other hand, if he be conscious of *not* doing well, he must bring as a sacrifice the animal-victim which now couches at the door of his tent. It is hard to say, what we can rationally understand by such language, except this: that an eucharistic vegetable-offering, by which the universal sovereignty of God was acknowledged, were a fit oblation indeed for a *sinless* creature; but that a piacular animal-sacrifice, by which the need of a vicarious atonement was formally confessed, could be the only suitable oblation for a *fallen* and *sinful* being.

It is plain however, that, if such be the purport of God's language to Cain, we must decide in favour of the second part of the alternative: for, in the very language itself, we have the doctrine of *vicarious piacularity* recognized and acted upon by the Supreme Being. Accordingly, this must strike every candid inquirer, as being the only rational decision which we can make. For let us adopt it; and every thing becomes easy and consistent: but let us reject it; and every thing is harsh, and incongruous, and unaccountable, and improbable. Agreeably to such a decision, God appears as the first institutor of sacrifice, at the precise point of time when an atonement first became necessary. But, it were of little moral utility to

institute a rite, unless the drift and purport of that rite were also fully explained. God therefore, I apprehend, in the very act of instituting sacrifice, set forth its nature and intent. The doctrine however of *vicarious piacularity* was far too important and consolatory to fallen man, for him ever to forget it when he had once authoritatively received it. *Corrupt* it indeed he might and did; though still, as we shall presently see, every corruption both of the rite and of the primeval doctrine associated with it serves but to shew whence the corruption itself originated: yet, while he *corrupted* it, he could never *forget* it. Hence we rationally account for the striking fact, of *the universal prevalence in all ages and countries of a tenet in itself altogether arbitrary:* hence too we rationally account for the still more striking fact, of *this arbitrary tenet, which was common alike to Jews and to Gentiles, being finally determined by the voice of inspiration to be a solemn and vital truth.* But, if, with the original institution of sacrifice, the doctrine of *vicarious piacularity* was revealed to our first parents: then it is clear, that an explanatory revelation was in effect vouchsafed, as to the meaning of that earliest prophecy which inaugurally comprized the sum and substance of the whole Patriarchal Dispensation.

(2.) With respect to the specific mode in which this explanatory revelation was made, I take it to have been, agreeably to the analogy of various

other revelations, partly by *expressive words*, and partly by *expressive actions*.

The grand and vital truth, which runs through all the three Dispensations: that *the Seed of the woman, instrumentally through the machinations of the infernal serpent, should suffer death in the place of the ruined human species; and that, by thus suffering it, he should effectually bruise the head of the serpent and recover to man what he had lost by the fall:* this grand and vital truth, without an adequate knowledge of which there could have been during the patriarchal ages no religion suitable to the wants of our degenerate race, was revealed in *expressive words*, to our first parents.

But, as words, in an infant state of society, are always found most naturally to have been set forth and explained by correspondent actions, which serve to communicate ideas in the precise way of a picture-history: so *the expressive words*, by which the inaugural prophecy was sufficiently explained for all salutary purposes, were accompanied by *expressive actions*. The animal-victim was the picture or representative of the predicted woman's Seed. His violent death upon the altar was but an hieroglyphical delineation of the violent death of his antitype. The notion of his suffering vicariously exhibited the true notion, which was to be entertained respecting the death of the promised Seed. And the aversation of God's wrath from the

sacrificer to the animal-victim minutely corresponded with and fully explained the aversation of his wrath from ruined man to the mysterious personage represented by the victim.

In short, *the expressive words* and *the expressive actions*, by which the Patriarchal Dispensation was inaugurated, bear precisely the same relation to each other, as *the expressive words* and *the expressive actions* of Hosea, by which he sets forth the future destinies of the house of Israel[1]: and, as in a subsequent age the sacrifice of the Messiah was scenically exhibited to Abraham in the actions of that sacred drama, which was performed by himself and his son; so, in the first ages, the same great sacrifice was scenically exhibited to Adam and to his children after him in the circumstances of that sacred drama, which was enacted both at the primeval institution and at every subsequent iteration of a piacular animal-offering[2].

(3.) Thus are we finally brought to the important result, that the doctrine of THE ATONEMENT, in its grand peculiar features, must have been made known, in perfectly intelligible terms, to our first parents.

By this I mean to say: that they must have learned, not only what Bishop Warburton allows they *might* have learned, namely, that *man by the divine assistance should be at length enabled*

[1] Hosea i, ii, iii. [2] Gen. xxii. 1—18.

to defeat all the machinations of his infernal enemy; but also that *man should be restored to his lost inheritance of a happy immortality by the sacrifice or death of that promised Deliverer, who was verbally announced under the title of the woman's Seed.*

So far, I apprehend, from what has been said, on this deeply interesting subject, they *must* have been instructed in the nature of sacrifice and therefore in the mystery of redemption. Whether they were also instructed in *the nature* of their predicted Deliverer, is not, I readily grant, equally clear. Yet the remarkable exclamation of Eve on the birth of Cain, *I have gotten* THE MAN *even* JEHOVAH HIS VERY SELF, which I have already taken occasion to notice; and certain extraordinary sentiments prevalent among the Gentiles, which I shall hereafter notice: these two matters, when viewed conjunctively, lead me to favour the opinion, that even the very nature of the promised Seed was not altogether unknown to the first race of mortals.

III. Bishop Warburton however strikes at the very root of the whole matter, by denying at once the divine institution of sacrifice, and by endeavouring to shew how easily it might have originated from merely familiar human sentiments.

1. I cannot help suspecting, that the pains, bestowed by the learned prelate upon this subject, lie deeper than the surface: I cannot re-

frain from thinking, that the divine origin of sacrifice would never have been contested, if it had not, by a train of consequences, materially affected the bishop's favourite opinion. For let us observe the doctrine, to which we are plainly led by the belief that the ordinance of sacrifice was a divine institution.

If, in the first instance, sacrifice were ordained of God: then we must reasonably conclude, that the vicarious piacularity of its nature was at the same time fully explained; for *without* such explanation, it is hard to conceive, how it could have been so universally known and acted upon long before the times of the Gospel. But, if the vicarious piacularity of its nature were fully explained: then the doctrine of *redemption and atonement and reconciliation* must also have been propounded. And, if this last doctrine were also propounded: then, the bishop himself being judge, the doctrine of *a future retributory state* must likewise have been made known; for, as his lordship very accurately remarks, *the knowledge of a future state of reward and punishment*, and *the knowledge of the redemption of man by the death and suffering of the promised Seed* are mutually dependent and therefore plainly inseparable[1].

Hence it appears, that Bishop Warburton

[1] Div. Leg. book v. sect. 6. p. 195.

could not allow *the primary divine institution of sacrifice*, without at the same time allowing to the first mortals *a knowledge of a future retributory state:* and hence, unless I be wholly mistaken, originated his vehement wish to prove, that the ordinance of sacrifice was purely of mere human invention. The establishment of this point was, in fact, necessary to the very existence of his system. Had not such been the case, the bishop *himself* would have immediately perceived, and would have readily shewn, the strict applicability of his own admirable remarks, on the concurrent and connected progress of language and of writing, to the primeval institution of sacrifice precisely after the fall: and, as he was the first writer who established the true idea which we ought to entertain respecting the interrupted sacrifice of Isaac by his father Abraham; so he would have analogically contended, that the original sacrifice in Paradise was wholly and designedly *scenical*, and that (after the manner of a picture-history passing into symbolical expression) it set forth by significant actions the same great truth which the spoken revelation set forth in significant words. The whole was so natural and so obvious; that nothing, I am persuaded, but the conscious fear of bringing his entire system into jeopardy, could have induced the bishop, in his theory respecting the origination of sacrifice, to depart

thus widely from the principles which he himself had so philosophically established[1].

2. Let us however attend his lordship in his attempted proof, that sacrifice was of mere human institution.

From the principles, to which I have just alluded, the bishop, it is true, does not wholly depart: but, as if aware of the point to which they would naturally conduct him, he dexterously endeavours to divert the current and to turn its full force in an opposite direction.

The principle, says he, *heretofore advanced, together with the reasoning on that principle concerning* THE ANCIENT MODE OF CONVERSE BY ACTION IN AID OF WORDS, *will lead us (so prolific is that principle in laying open the most secret treasures of antiquity) to the true rationale of this widely extended, and as widely mistaken, rite of sacrifice. This will shew, how the common sentiments of our nature would draw the first men into this mode of worship, whether the sacrifice was* EUCHARISTICAL *or* PROPITIATORY *or* EXPIATORY. *Under one or other of these classes, I suppose, all sorts of sacrifice may be reasonably comprised. For the sentiments, which nature and reason excite in every pious breast towards the author and support of our being, are simply these:* GRATITUDE, *for good bestowed;* APPLICATION *to him, for good sought or wanted;*

[1] See Div. Leg. book iv. sect. 4. book vi. sect. 5.

and REPENTANCE *for, and* DEPRECATION *of, crimes committed*[1].

Excellent and philosophical in the main as this general enunciation is, we may readily perceive even *in limine* that lurking fallacy, which must prove fatal to his whole theory respecting the institution of the first sacrifice. *The sentiment of* GRATITUDE is doubtless well represented by *the action of an* EUCHARISTICAL *sacrifice;* and *the sentiment of precatory* APPLICATION is also well represented by *the action of a* PROPITIATORY *sacrifice:* but *the sentiment of* REPENTANCE *and* DEPRECATION is NOT accurately represented by *the action of that sacrifice which is called* EXPIATORY. Of this, the reason is abundantly obvious. The sentiment, *really* attached in every age and in every quarter of the globe to *the action of an* EXPIATORY *sacrifice,* is much more *complex* than *the naked sentiment of* REPENTANCE *and* DEPRECATION which the bishop would exhibit as *strictly parallel* to the action. This sentiment *includes,* no doubt, *the sentiment of* REPENTANCE *and* DEPRECATION; but then it comprehends likewise *much more:* for it comprehends the additional and (in truth) *palmary* idea of PIACULARITY, which enters not at all into *the naked sentiment of* REPENTANCE. According to the unanimous consent of antiquity, whether Gentile or Judaical, each EX-

[1] Div. Leg. book ix. chap. 2. p. 275.

PIATORY sacrifice not only expressed by a significant action, that the sacrificer REPENTED of his transgressions and that he DEPRECATED the wrath of heaven; but it LIKEWISE expressed by the same significant action, that the sacrificer believed his offences to be REMITTED or ATONED FOR through virtue of the sacrificed animal's DEATH, and that he confidently expected the merited wrath of heaven TO BE TRANSFERRED FROM HIMSELF TO THE SLAUGHTERED VICTIM[1]. If then the rite of EXPIATORY sacrifice was *a mode of converse by action in aid of words;* a point, in which I perfectly agree with the learned prelate: the sentiment, associated with the action, must of course be the sentiment, which was meant to be expressed, and which would be expressed *verbally* whenever *words* were used rather than *actions*. But this sentiment, as all antiquity testifies, was *not* the naked sentiment of REPENTANCE *for, and* DEPRECATION *of, crimes committed;* for I wish to speak in the precise terms adopted by the bishop himself: but it was the complex sentiment of REPENTANCE AND DEPRECATION *united with the idea of* A PIACULARLY VICARIOUS ATONEMENT.

In discussing the merits of the present question, we have no *real* concern with EUCHARISTI-

[1] See Magee on Atonement and Sacrifice No. xxxiii. and Origin of Pagan Idol. book ii. chap. 8.

CAL and PROPITIATORY sacrifices. Whatever was their *true* origin, I freely concede, that they *might* have been of mere human invention. For, as the bishop justly remarks, *the sentiment of* GRATITUDE is naturally expressed by *the outward sign or action of* BRINGING A GIFT: and *the sentiment of* PRECATORY APPLICATION is no less naturally expressed by *the outward sign or action of* BRINGING A CONCILIATORY OFFERING. But our *exclusive* business at present is with the EXPIATORY or PIACULAR sacrifice: for in this sacrifice ALONE is involved the idea of VICARIOUS ATONEMENT THROUGH THE DEATH OF ANOTHER and of A TRANSFER OF GOD'S WRATH FROM THE SACRIFICER TO THE VICTIM; an idea, which (as the bishop was well aware) inevitably comprehended, in the case of our fallen progenitors, the ultimate idea of RECONCILIATION AND RECOVERED IMMORTALITY. How then does his lordship manage the matter, when he comes to the consideration of EXPIATORY sacrifice?

He has placed mankind, as we have seen, from the fall down to the promulgation of the Law, under the sole guidance of *natural* religion. Now, though GRATITUDE and PRAYER and REPENTANCE be all branches of *natural* religion: the doctrine of A VICARIOUS ATONEMENT and of A PIACULAR TRANSFER OF GOD'S WRATH most assuredly enters not into its constitution. As unbelievers very truly remark, and as the

bishop of necessity allows them to be quite in the right, *natural* religion knows nothing of any such doctrine: *natural* religion only *does*, and only *can*, teach, that an offender may hope for pardon through A HEARTY REPENTANCE and A SINCERE PURPOSE OF AMENDMENT[1]. Such then, according to his lordship, being the condition of man from the fall to the Law; whence does he bring a most extraordinary doctrine, which forms no part of *natural* religion, and which has nevertheless prevailed universally in every age and in every country? He cuts the Gordian knot by resolving the whole matter into sheer superstition.

In expiatory sacrifices, says the bishop, *matters went still worse* than they did in those which were eucharistical and propitiatory. *For, in these, the passion of fear being predominant, strange enormities were soon superadded to the follies of the worshippers. In these, the offering of the slain animal began, first of all, to be vainly considered as* A VICARIOUS ATONEMENT *for the crimes of the sacrificer. But a deep-rooted superstition is always spreading wide and more wide. When men, thus labouring under this evil, had (in order to give themselves ease) gone so far as to indulge the fancy of* A VICARIOUS SACRIFICE, *it was natural for them to think of enhancing so cheap an atonement by the cost and rarity of the offering: and, oppressed*

[1] Div. Leg. book ix. chap. 2. p. 282.

with their malady, they never rested, till they had got to that which they conceived to be the most precious of all, a human sacrifice[1].

The vagaries of superstition are so wild and eccentric, that it is doubtless hard to say, what it may or may not excogitate. Yet, in this theory of the bishop, there are two things which cannot but strike the diligent inquirer after truth.

(1.) Of these, the first is, according to what is called the doctrine of chances, *the rare and extraordinary felicity of a mere random superstitious excursion from the narrow realms of the religion of nature.*

A tenet, which allowedly constitutes no part of natural religion, is, among a thousand other possible tenets, accidentally hit upon by hoodwinked superstition in one of her blind rambles through the dominions of the enchantress fancy. This identical tenet however, which, during the reign of natural religion, could have been neither more nor less than a vain unauthorized folly, proves eventually to be the most awful and sacred truth of Christianity itself.

I shall not pretend to calculate the chance of making so fortunate a guess: yet it seems extraordinary, that the essence of that mystery, which the very angels desire to look into, should have been struck out by a blind superstition in

[1] Div. Leg. book ix. chap. 2. p. 282, 285.

one of her wayward excursions through the regions of fancy.

(2.) But this is not the whole: there is yet a second thing, scarcely less wonderful, to be accounted for; I mean, *the universal prevalence of the tenet.*

Superstition will sometimes stumble upon strange phantasies, of which no reasonable solution can be given: but, in that case, such phantasies will be *local* and *confined.* Springing not from any *general* feelings of our common nature, they themselves, if they have been accidentally struck out in this country or in that country, will be limited to the region which may have given them birth. Rites and notions, which may be satisfactorily traced up to the workings of *nature herself,* may originate *independently* in various quarters of the globe: but rites and notions, which are *altogether arbitrary,* can only, on a reasonable calculation of probabilities, have commenced in one or at the most in two countries. Hence, if we find an ARBITRARY notion UNIVERSALLY PREVALENT from the deepest antiquity, we may be morally sure, that all, who hold it, must have received it from *some common primeval source.*

Now this is the identical case with the doctrine of A PIACULAR ATONEMENT THROUGH THE SACRIFICE OF AN ANIMAL-VICTIM.

The doctrine in question is confessedly no doctrine of *natural* religion: yet do we find it

universally prevalent in every age and in every country, respecting which any accounts have come down to us. How then are we to solve the problem of this UNIVERSALITY? I see no mode of doing it satisfactorily, except by calling in the theory of A COMMON ORIGINATION. But, if we call in this theory to our relief, it will conduct us back to a time when all mankind formed but a single great family: in other words, it will conduct us back to a period, anterior to the dispersion from Babel. Superstition therefore must have been at work, in framing the doctrine of PIACULARITY, at least as early as the days of Noah: and, if the tenet were of antediluvian growth; then an unauthorized fancy must have been transmitted to the new world through the medium of an eminently pious patriarch and his family. Yet, after all, this identical *phantasy*, produced by fear and hatched by superstition either before the deluge or immediately subsequent to it, turns out at length to be that awful *reality*, which constitutes the very basis of the Christian Dispensation.

IV. Such are the difficulties, which attend the theory of Bishop Warburton relative to the mere *human* origin of EXPIATORY sacrifice. If they be of so dark a complexion, as to compel us to abandon his theory; then we must adopt the belief, that that ordinance was of divine institution: a belief, which is encumbered with

none of those perplexing circumstances that hamper the opposite system; a belief, which perfectly harmonizes with the known tenor of the three connected Dispensations; a belief, which exhibits God as speaking the language of mercy to his fallen creatures at the precise time when they most required the consolation of such language.

On the whole then I conclude, that an explanatory revelation, as to the purport of the first prophecy, was vouchsafed to Adam and Eve, at the time when EXPIATORY sacrifice was divinely instituted: that the ordinance in question was itself a part of the explanatory revelation, on the principle that *significant action* was employed in aid of *significant words:* and that from this compound revelation, partly scenical and partly verbal, the doctrine of AN ATONEMENT THROUGH THE PIACULAR DEATH OF THE WOMAN'S PROMISED SEED was set forth to the guilty pair and their descendants, with sufficient clearness to form the basis of the Patriarchal Dispensation and thus to answer every salutary purpose.

With regard to the NATURE of the predicted Deliverer, we have seen what evidence there is *from Scripture* for believing that that also was made known to our first parents: we have next to inquire, what evidence to the same purpose is afforded by the religious notions of the Gen-

tiles; and the prosecution of this inquiry will tend additionally to shew, that the doctrine of A PIACULAR ATONEMENT must have been revealed to mankind from the very beginning.

CHAPTER VI.

RESPECTING THE KNOWLEDGE OF THE DOCTRINE OF REDEMPTION POSSESSED BY MANKIND DURING THE PATRIARCHAL AGES, SO FAR AS THE MATTER CAN BE ASCERTAINED FROM THE OLD THEOLOGY OF THE GENTILES.

THE old theology of the Gentiles may be compared to an intricate lock with many wards, the key to which has been lost. If the true key be not found, the lock cannot be opened. A false key, by touching some of the wards, may *seem* to move the reluctant springs: but, unless every ward be accurately fitted, the lock will not open. It is of the last importance therefore to recover the true key: and the only mode, in which we can ascertain the true key, is by trying whether it will correspond with every ward.

I. More than a single key has been confidently produced by different artists: let us examine, how far each has accomplished the desired purpose.

1. Some inquirers have fancied, that, in the reveries of Paganism, they can discover an abstract theory of the progress of the human mind, from patriarchal truth to the lowest stage of idolatrous error; and have imagined, that they can develop a variety of doctrinal speculations, which are either the results of a refined philosophy or the half-stifled voice of a primitive revelation. Hence, according to *this* system, the history of pagan idolatry is, in fact, a history of gradual theologic corruption: and its leading hypothesis or principle is, that the gods of the Gentiles were neither more nor less than physical objects allegorically personified; into the adoration of which mankind gradually apostatised, when they forsook the pure patriarchal worship of the one living Jehovah.

2. Others again, observing the evident connection between the heavenly bodies and certain persons who are said to have played their part as men upon earth, have conjectured, that the Sun, the Moon, the Planets, the Stars, and the Constellations, having been poetically described by the early astronomers as living agents, were thence gradually supposed to be men: and, when they were thus supposed to be men, they were further thought to have been the earliest princes and heroes of each kingdom and country. Upon *this* scheme, therefore, no such men ever *really* existed; the personified Host of Heaven, in exhibiting their various

sidereal phenomena, having been mistaken by erring posterity for a set of mortals who once *literally* flourished upon earth.

3. A third class of inquirers, equally observing the connection between the celestial bodies and certain intellectual agents who are declared to have been once men, have adopted a directly opposite system. They conceive, that the persons, *declared* to have been once men, actually *were* once men: and, as such, they of course suppose, that they did indeed formerly play a very conspicuous part upon this terraqueous globe. Whence then originated their connection with the heavenly bodies? The reply to such a question is: that, after death, their souls were thought, as regents, to animate and govern the Host of Heaven; and that they were worshipped by surviving mortals here below, as Deastri or astronomical Hero-gods.

II. Respecting these different theories, each of which either now has or has once had its warm advocates, it may seem reasonable to make the following general observation.

An inquiry into the origin and nature of pagan idolatry, like an inquiry into any other historical fact, must, if we wish it to be satisfactory, rest wholly and exclusively *upon evidence*. As it is excellently remarked by Bishop Warburton, *every reasonable hypothesis should be supported on a fact*[1]. If therefore it be not thus

[1] Div. Leg. book vi. sect. 2. Notes. p. 458.

supported, the hypothesis, with whatever plausibility it may be drawn out, is *not* reasonable. We may amuse ourselves indeed with speculations and conjectures: and we may excogitate a specious and well-rounded theory. Such a theory and such speculations we may fondly denominate *philosophical*: because they accord with what, we suppose, must needs have been the progress of the human mind from truth to error. But, when we have arrived at the end of these labours, upon what basis do they rest? Truly, if we are to ascertain *facts* on the principles of *abstract reasoning*, we shall make but sorry work with history: or, if, partially calling in evidence to the aid of our philosophy, we select what may seem to favour our system and omit such testimonies as might appear hostile to it, we shall not be very likely to arrive at the truth. In every inquiry of the present nature, we cannot too strongly impress it upon our minds, that the basis, upon which we rear our temple, must be *naked historical evidence*. From the various combined parts of this evidence, when faithfully adduced, we may indeed draw such inferences as appear the most reasonable: but still *evidence*, not *philosophy*, is the foundation upon which we must build our superstructure. Concerning the opinions of the Gentiles we know nothing, save what they themselves have thought fit to tell us. We may expatiate as long as we please in the realms of *abstract rea-*

soning, and we may amuse ourselves with terming our speculations *philosophical* or *enlightened*: but, unless we build upon *direct historical testimony*, we in fact are but building castles on the sand which the flowing tide will speedily wash away. The real question must ever be this: *What do the Gentiles themselves tell us of their gods and their doctrines?*

Let us then, withdrawing the present inquiry from the province of philosophy and abstract reasoning with which it has no manner of concern, refer it, as it ought to be referred, to *naked evidence*: and, on that only sure principle, let us ask; what are the several claims of the three systems, which have been described?

1. The first of them builds upon evidence *to a certain extent*, because it adduces various passages which set forth some peculiar notions held by the Gentiles; such, for instance, as the doctrine of *the Metempsychosis*, the doctrine of *two conflicting Principles*, the doctrine of *emanations from that being who was venerated as the chief divinity*, and the like: but, so far as I can judge, it both deals too largely in conjecture, and may be charged too justly with omission.

Thus it neither satisfactorily accounts for the rise of Sabianism and Hero-worship: nor does it give any such elucidation of the remarkably uniform stories told respecting the pagan deities, as the mind can rest upon with confidence. It supposes indeed, that, in the progress of error,

those deities were framed by a personification of the powers of nature, and that their deeds represent the operations of physical objects: nor do I deny, that some evidence may be brought forward in favour of such a conjecture; so far from it, there cannot be a doubt, that pantheistic Materialism was an important and essentially constituent part of ancient Paganism. But, if we stop at this point, we scarcely half unfold the mysteries of gentile idolatry. We quite omit the vital circumstance, that the imaginary pantheus is declared by the very strongest evidence to have once lived, a substantial human being, upon this identical globe which we ourselves inhabit; and to have been also, not only a fancied soul of the Universe, but likewise an intelligent spirit residing after death in the solar orb: we quite omit the vital circumstance, that the imaginary panthea is declared to have been a woman, the common mother of mankind; is declared to have been a ship, which floated on the surface of an interminable ocean; is declared to have been, not only the material Universe in general, but likewise both the Earth below and the Moon in the sphere: and we quite omit the no less vital circumstance, that, while the various gods and goddesses are sometimes said to be allegorical representations of *different* physical objects, they are likewise pronounced to be all ultimately resolvable into a *single* god and a *single* goddess. So far as we

can collect from the *general* testimonies of the ancients themselves, their idolatry consisted of three branches closely interwoven with each other; Hero-worship, Sabianism, and Materialism[1]. Hence, if we so treat of the subject as to omit any one of these three branches; we may indeed produce a scheme sufficiently plausible and amusing, a scheme too founded partially upon the truth: but we shall exhibit a very imperfect view, and in some respects a very erroneous view, of the theology of the Gentiles, as explained by themselves.

Nor is this the only objection. Since every believer in revelation must admit, that the pure worship of Patriarchism preceded the corrupt worship of Paganism; and since the *uniform* texture of heathen mythology proves abundantly, that it must have been first contrived *before* mankind were separated into various communities and *when* they were all united in one great body[2]: the difficulty is to conceive, how idolatry, as exhibited under the present system, could ever have *at all* sprung up. The doctrine of *emanations* might indeed have been struck out by some fanciful theorist. But by what link shall we attach to the patriarchal creed the naked dogma of the Metempsychosis,

[1] See this matter fully drawn out in Origin of Pagan Idol. book i. chap. 1. § I, II, III.

[2] See this argument from uniformity in matters arbitrary prosecuted in Origin of Pagan Idol. book i. chap. 1. § IV.

the worship of the heavenly bodies, and the idolatrously allegorical personification of physical objects? By what gradual process of the human mind was it, that men, accustomed to the sincere and rational worship of Patriarchism, adopted, at a period *prior* to the dispersion from Babel (for, unless this be granted, we shall find it impossible to account for the striking uniformity of Paganism throughout the whole world *in matters purely arbitrary*), the notion, that *human souls passed after death into other bodies, instead of having their lot finally determined to happiness or misery;* the tenet, that *certain allegorical personifications of physical objects ought to be adored as present and potent deities;* and the doctrine, that *the heavenly bodies ought to be worshipped as gods,* when it has been explicitly taught from Adam by Noah that they were the mere handy work of Jehovah? If pagan idolatry *thus* began, it must have had such a beginning *at some time.* But the time is fixed, by the circumstance of its complete uniformity in arbitrary particulars, to a period when all mankind were united in a single community. By what train of thought then, if the matter is to be argued philosophically, were they all led to apostatise from Patriarchism into an idolatry thus defined. We may safely assume, that idolatry, in the first instance, must have been built upon some universally recognized principles of Patriarchism. What then were the principles, upon which the

edifice, as marked out in the present system, was erected? *Prominent*, no doubt, they must have been: otherwise, it is impossible to account for the *general* apostasy. If then *prominent*, they can easily be pointed out. Again therefore I ask, what were they? It is clear, that *at present* we have no familiar principles, upon which we might build *the Metempsychosis* or *the worship of the Heavenly Host* or *the adoration of physical objects personified*: it is clear, that, if we adopted such speculations, we should find it no easy matter to induce all our countrymen to symbolize with us. I can conceive indeed, that an ignorant ill-educated Christian might in a foreign land be seduced into idolatry by the force of bad example: but, in the case before us, in the case of mankind during the first ages after the deluge, a depraved example was out of the question; while *all* were worshippers of the true God, they lapsed with one accord into idolatry. What then were the *steps*, what were the *principles*, by which they *did* thus lapse? If idolatry originated under the form, in which it is exhibited by the system now before us, I am at a loss to account for *the fact* of its origination.

In reality, though this allegorizing system, which would make the heathen gods and goddesses *mere* personifications of physical objects, may claim a considerable degree of antiquity: yet we both have it expressly declared to be *an innovation* upon the genuine primeval system,

which held forth deified mortals as the proper objects of worship; and we likewise even have the first author of it specially pointed out to us.

Sanchoniatho, or his translator Philo Byblius, after largely treating of the apotheosis of Uranus and Cronus and Dagon and the other members of the great primitive family whom he describes as having once literally flourished upon earth, goes on to mention and to censure *a fanciful innovation* upon this early theology. Now, *the innovation was no other than the identical system at present under consideration.* Its author was a Phenician hierophant, whose own name is not mentioned, but who is said to have been the son of one Thabion: and his innovation upon the old Hero-worship of his country consisted in an allegorizing of those historical facts which are detailed *as such* by Sanchoniatho, and in a mingling or confounding of them with the physical affections of the Universe. Having struck out this novel scheme, he communicated it to the prophets or ministers who presided over the Orgies: and these, having carried it to a yet greater length, handed it down both to their successors and to those foreigners who were willing to be taught by them. Hence the notion was carried both into Egypt and into Greece[1].

[1] The whole passage is so important and decisive, that I give it in the original. Ταυτα παντα ὁ Θαβιωνος παις, πρωτος των απ' αιωνος γεγονοτων Φοινικων ἱεροφαντης αλληγορησας, τοις τε

Agreeably to this, Philo remarks, that the genuine mythologic system as exhibited by Sanchoniatho, namely the system that *the gods and goddesses of the Gentiles were dead men and women*, throws much well deserved blame on those modern innovators; who, by dint of mere fanciful straining and without any regard to truth, would transmute the traditionary fables relative to the hero-gods into allegories and speculative physiological discussions[1].

φυσικοις και κοσμικοις παθεσιν ανεμιξας, παρεδωκε τοις οργιωσι και τελετων καταρχησι προφηταις. Οι δε τον τυφον αυξειν εκ παντος επινοουντες, τοις αυτων διαδοχοις παρεδωσαν και τοις επεισακτοις. Euseb. Præp. Evan. lib i. c 10. p 25. Edit. Stephan.

[1] Ταυτα ειπων, επιμεμφεται τοις ΝΕΩΤΕΡΟΙΣ ΤΟΙΣ ΜΕΤΑ ΤΑΥΤΑ, ως αν ΒΕΒΙΑΣΜΕΝΩΣ και ΟΥΚ ΑΛΗΘΩΣ τους περι θεων μυθους επ' αλληγοριας και φυσικας διηγησεις τε και θεωριας αναγουσι λεγει ὁ' ουν πρόϊων. Ἀλλ' οι μεν νεωτεροι των ἱερολογων τα μεν γεγονοτα πραγματα εξ αρχης απεπεμψαντο, αλληγοριας και μυθους επινοησαντες, και τοις κοσμικοις παθημασι συγγενειαν πλασαμενοι, μυστηρια κατεστησαν. Και πολυν αυτοις επηγον τυφον, ως μη ραδιως τινα συνορᾳν ΤΑ ΚΑΤ' ΑΛΗΘΕΙΑΝ γενομενα. Euseb. Præp. Evan. lib. i. c. 10. p 25. Much the same remark is made by Eusebius on the humour of physiologising the religious system of the Egyptians, when in truth it was founded on the worship of dead men. Νεκρων ἀρα ἡ πασα ἁυτων θεοποιια καθεστηκε. Πεπλασται δ' αυτοις τα της φυσιολογιας. Τι γαρ εχρην ανδρων και γυναικων σχηματα ζωοπλαστειν, παρον, και διχα τουτων, ἡλιον σεβειν και σεληνην και τα λοιπα του κοσμου στοιχεια; και τι χρη θνηταις προσηγοριαις, τας καθολου φυσεις επιφημιζειν; Τα δε καθ' ἑκαστον θεον μυστηρια, οι τε ὑμνοι και αι ᾠδαι, και των τελετων τα απορρητα, ποτερα των καθολου στοιχειων, η των παλαι θνητων ανδρων των τοις θεοις ὁμωνυμων, επαγονται τα συμβολα; Αλλα γαρ πλανας και μεθας και ερωτας, φθορας τε γυναικων, και ανδρων επιβουλας, και μυρια ἀττα θνητα ὡς αληθως και αισχρα και ασεμνα, ἑως αν τις αναθειη τοις καθολου στοιχειοις, αυτοθεν το θνητον και ανθρωποπαθες επενηνεγμενα, ὡστε, εκ τουτων ἁπαντων, ἀλωσκεσθαι την ΘΑΥΜΑΣΤΗΝ ταυτην και ΓΕΝΝΑΙΑΝ φυσιολογιαν, ΚΑΤ' ΟΥΔΕΝ ΑΛΗ-

From the Greeks, this *painfully strained* and *utterly false* system, as Philo somewhat unceremoniously designates a theory which its modern admirers have celebrated as eminently *philosophical* and *enlightened:* from the Greeks, this system, first invented by the fanciful son of Thabion, seems to have passed to certain of the Latins. Thus Varro endeavoured to allegorize into the elements or parts of the world those hero-gods, who, as St. Austin well remarks in exact accordance with the best informed of the Gentiles, were in truth only deceased mortals who had once played their part in this nether world[1]. So mischievous is it to the cause of truth, when men, departing from plain historical evidence, strike out visionary schemes of their own, and then please themselves with styling such far-fetched speculations *philosophical:* These pretended allegories, into which some would transmute the fables of the Gentiles, making them the vehicles of natural and moral and divine truths, are well characterized by Gregory Nazianzen. He calls them *monstrous explanations without any fixed principles, in which there is nothing stable:* and he describes them as constituting a mode of interpretation, which, if in-

ΘΕΙΑΣ 'ΗΜΜΕΝΗΝ, *ουδε τι θειον αληθως επαγομενην*, ΒΕΒΙΑΣΜΕΝΗΝ *δε, και* ΔΙΕΨΕΥΣΜΕΝΗΝ *εχουσαν την εξωθεν σεμνολογιαν*; Euseb. Præp. Evan. lib. iii. c. 2. p. 56.

[1] August. de Civ. Dei. lib. viii. c. 5.

dulged, would enable you to make any thing out of any thing[1].

2. So much for the first of the three systems: the second also rests upon evidence to a certain extent; for, no doubt, several of the ancients pronounce their gods to be the heavenly bodies, and explain their legendary histories by the physical motions and operations of those bodies: but this affords only a very mutilated and imperfect account of Paganism.

If we so admit the testimony of the Gentiles, as to *exclude* the idea, that their gods were once likewise mortal men; if we so admit their testimony, as to contend, that the mythologic tales of idolatry were *not* perverted narratives of human transactions written hieroglyphically upon the sphere, but that they *really* allude *only* to the natural history of the Host of Heaven fabulously transferred to a set of *purely imaginary* heroes upon earth: if such be the basis of our system, it rests upon a manifest contempt of the very strongest evidence that can possibly be adduced.

That the gods of the Gentiles were the heavenly bodies, is not denied: no point indeed can be more clearly established. But this is not precisely the question. The *real* question is, whether they were the heavenly bodies *alone*;

[1] Greg. Naz. Orat. iii.

or whether they were the heavenly bodies, worshipped *in conjunction with* certain mortal heroes: whether the stories told of them relate, in all instances, *exclusively* to the motions of the heavenly bodies; or whether they do not *properly* relate to the actions of men upon earth, though by an ingenious refinement they may have been *applied* also to the operations of those men's sidereal representatives. This is the *true* question: yet it is a question, which has unfortunately been quite overlooked by the advocates of the present system. Like the votaries of that which was last considered, they satisfy themselves with *partial* testimony: hence it is easy to foresee, that their conclusions will be erroneous.

I may add, that this theory also, like the other, is attended with no small difficulties as to the mode of its origination.

We may here, a second time, ask: by what process of the human mind were all men led, at a very early period, to corrupt the worship of Jehovah by the adoration of the heavenly bodies? In the first instance, they could not, like the Israelites, have been *mingled with the heathen* and have THUS *learned their ways:* for at the commencement of postdiluvian idolatry, there were no heathen among whom the children of Noah COULD be mingled. This species of idolatry, if it were the *aboriginal* and *proper* ido-

latry of the Gentiles, must have emanated from Patriarchism. By what steps *did* it emanate? On what principles did mankind at an era *prior* to the dispersion, agree unanimously to devote themselves to the worship of those orbs, which yet from their earliest youth they would have been taught to consider as the mere handy-work of the Supreme Intelligence? The great difficulty is, to lay down, after a rational and satisfactory manner, the extraordinary mental process, by which; at some time or another, though certainly *before* the dispersion from Babel, a family of sound worshippers of Jehovah could have lapsed into the follies of pagan idolatry. A positive fact, namely *the existence of idolatry* PRIOR TO *the days of Abraham:* for *this* fact stands specifically recorded, whether idolatry itself sprang up before the dispersion or not: a positve fact, of a most remarkable nature, stares us in the face[1]. The question is, how we are rationally to account for it.

[1] The testimony to *the fact* is unequivocal. *Thus saith the Lord God of Israel: Your fathers dwelt on the other side of the flood in old time, Terah the father of Abraham and the father of Nachor: and* THEY SERVED OTHER GODS. Josh. xxiv. 2. Nor was idolatry confined to the province of Babylonia: Abraham found it also in Palestine, when he migrated thither. This is manifest from the circumstance of a Canaanitish town being denominated *Ashteroth-Karnaim.* Doubtless it was so called in honour of the lunar goddess

3. I now come to the third system; which, from a conviction of its truth, I consider last in order.

According to this system, certain illustrious men were venerated as Gods by the Gentiles: and, when those men were removed from the present world by the hand of death, they were supposed to be translated to heaven; where they occupy as intellectual regents the various celestial bodies, still looking down from those lofty stations upon the affairs of mortals. Such being the case, however wildly their history may have been disguised by symbolizing fiction, and however in some instances astronomical allegory may have been grafted upon it: yet their history, in its grand outline, is the history of events, which actually occurred upon earth though they have since been written upon the sphere.

The supposed translation of these dead men to the heavenly bodies constituted the union of Hero-worship and Sabianism: or rather, to speak more properly, converted mere astronomy into direct astrolatry. Hence, various matters were predicated of the Sun and of the Moon, which have not the slightest connection with those luminaries themselves; unless indeed we be re-

Astartè the horned. But, if it received its *name* from that divinity, the *worship* of the divinity herself must plainly have been established among the Canaanites even at that early period. See Gen. xiv. 5.

solved, at all hazards, to call in the aid of that *painfully strained* and *utterly false* system (as Philo describes it), which owed its birth to the prolific brain of the son of Thabion. The matters themselves were really transacted by substantial human beings: and it was only in consequence of an imaginary connection of those human beings with the Sun and the Moon, that what was exclusively peculiar to the former came to be predicated of the latter.

An extension of the idea, which produced Sabianism, produced also Materialism: but yet Hero-worship which I deem the germ of the whole system, its offspring Sabianism, and its more remote offspring Materialism, must, as the argument from *the uniformity of Paganism in matters arbitrary* sufficiently demonstrates, have all been in existence, and have all been united in one theological code, *prior* to the dispersion from Babel. As the soul of the great father was placed in the Sun, whence he seems to govern and animate the whole Universe: it was an easy extension of the idea, to pronounce him the vivifying soul of the world, to esteem the subtle ether the medium of his operations, and to give him crude matter for his allegorical body or consort.

Thus, from Hero-worship blended with Astronomy and Physics, was produced the triple though united system of pagan idolatry [1].

[1] See Origin of Pagan Idol. book i. chap. 1.

(1.) And now, for the hypothesis thus drawn out; the hypothesis, that, *in consequence of the elevation of real mortals to the sphere, their fabulized history came to be inscribed upon it:* for this hypothesis, which is the direct inverse of the theory that pronounces *the apparent agents in pagan theology to be mere personifications of the heavenly bodies and to have never had any existence upon earth, their history being a disguised history of celestial revolutions brought down to this nether world, instead of being a disguised history of terrestrial events written upon the sphere:* for this hypothesis, I say, what *evidence* are we able to produce; for it must never be forgotten, that the whole is *a question of evidence,* not *a question of philosophy?*

To reproduce the various testimonies, which have elsewhere been so copiously brought forward, were plainly superfluous[1]: I shall content myself therefore with exhibiting no more than three, which however are a host in themselves.

Osiris, says Plutarch, *was an ancient king of Egypt; who civilized his barbarous countrymen, who taught them how to cultivate the earth, who gave them a code of laws for their civil government, and who instructed them in the proper mode of worshipping the gods. After his death, he was buried (according to Eudoxus) at Busiris, where also he*

[1] Origin of Pagan Idol. passim.

was born. Nor was his corpse alone deposited among the Egyptians: it is asserted by the priesthood, that the bodies likewise of all the other gods, who equally with himself both were born and were liable to corruption, are laid up and are carefully preserved among them; while their flitting souls shine as stars in the heavens. Thus was Isis translated into the Dog-star; Horus, into Orion; and Typhon, into the great Bear[1].

In a similar strain speaks St. Austin: and *that* too, on such direct and unobjectionable authority; that he may well claim and exercise the right of censuring Varro, who advocated the wild and novel system of the philosophizing son of Thabion.

Of the same nature, says he, *are those things, which Alexander of Macedon wrote to his mother, as revealed to him by one Leo, chief hierophant of the Egyptian Mysteries: whereby it appeared, that not only such as Picus and Faunus and Eneas and Romulus, nay Hercules and Esculapius and Bacchus the son of Semelè and Castor and Pollux and all others of the same rank, had been advanced, from the condition of mortal men, into gods; but likewise even those deities of the higher order, the* Dii majorum gentium, *those, whom Cicero without naming seems to hint at in his Tusculans, such as Jupiter and Juno and Saturn and Neptune and Vulcan and Vesta and many others (whom Varro*

[1] Plutarch. de Isid. et Osir. § 13, 21.

endeavours to allegorize into the elements or parts of the world), were, in truth, only deceased mortals. But the priest, being under great fears and apprehensions while he was telling this, as conscious that he was betraying the secret of the Mysteries, begged of Alexander, when he found that he intended to communicate it to his mother, that he would enjoin her to burn the letter, as soon as she had read it[1].

Such was the doctrine taught in the Egyptian Mysteries: the very same also was inculcated in the Eleusinian Orgies, as we expressly learn from the passage of Cicero to which Austin alludes.

The very rites of sepulture prove, that death is not annihilation, but only a sort of passage and change of life: which is wont to conduct illustrious men and women to heaven; while others remain unable to extricate themselves from that earth, which, during their embodied state, had been their habitation. On this principle it is, that we esteem Romulus a hero-god, ascribing to him a seat among the immortals: and, on the same principle, the Greeks have elevated Hercules to a similar rank; a doctrine, which has passed from them to us and even to the remote ocean. In like manner we account for the deity of Bacchus, of Castor and Pollux, and of Ino by the Greeks denominated Leucothea *by us Romans* Matuta. *But what? Is not*

[1] Aug. de Civ. Dei. lib. viii. c. 5. cited and translated by Bishop Warburton.

almost all heaven (not to carry on this detail any further) filled with the human race? If I should search out and examine antiquity, and if from those things which the Grecian writers have delivered I should go to the bottom of this affair; it would be found, that even those very gods themselves, who are deemed the Dii majorum gentium, *had their original here below, and ascended from hence into heaven. Inquire, to whom those sepulchres belong, which are so commonly shewn in Greece. Remember, for you are initiated, what you have been taught in the Mysteries. You will then at length understand, how far this matter may be carried*[1].

Such evidence is plainly decisive of the question; unless indeed a naked historical fact is to be determined by conjecture and abstract reasoning, rather than by express testimony. We have here, not the bare opinion of a speculative individual, but the authoritative decision of those who traditionally interpreted the Mysteries: we have here in short, if I may be pardoned the expression, the standard doctrine of orthodox Paganism. The tenet was alike inculcated in the Mysteries of Egypt, when the Macedonian Alexander flourished; and in the Mysteries of Eleusis, when the Roman Cicero was initiated. Nor was it any way peculiar to *those* Orgies. In every quarter of the globe, as the gods were the same canonized human beings,

[1] Cicer. Tusc. Disp. lib. i. c. 12, 13.

so the Mysteries were still the same ordinance[1]. Hence we are expressly informed, that the identical tenet of *the mortal origin of the gods* was equally inculcated in the Pelasgic Rites of Samothrace and in the Orgies of Lemnos and Crete[2]. The doctrine, then, was universal in point of reception: nor was it less extensive in point of application. NONE of the popular gods are excepted from the sweeping comprehensiveness of the general rule: ALL are equally declared, to have been once men, and to have been translated to heaven subsequent to their death upon earth. Not only the heroes and demi-gods of mythologic story are said to have once played a part in this world: but even the very chief of the pagan divinities are positively asserted, and *that* in the Mysteries themselves, to have been in reality nothing more, so far as their true origin is concerned, than deified mortal men. Varro, apparently misled, as some modern mythologists have been misled after him, by the undoubted circumstance of Materialism having been ingrafted upon Hero-worship, might endeavour (as Austin speaks) to allegorize the superior gods into the elements or parts of the world: but, if it were his wish so to allegorize them as to *exclude* the tenet of their mortal origination, he stands convicted of error on the

[1] See Origin of Pagan Idol, book v. chap. 6. § I.

[2] Cicer. de nat. deor. lib. i. c. 42. Jul. Firm. de error. prof. rel. p. 13, 19.

express testimony of the hierophants of Egypt and Eleusis and Samothrace and Lemnos and Crete: a testimony too delivered, not at *this* particular period or at *that* particular period only, but with strict consistency at *all* times, as we may fairly argue from the doctrine being the very same throughout Egypt and at Eleusis in the days of Alexander and of Cicero. If then the pagan gods were all, without exception, formerly men; the actions ascribed to them, though sometimes disguised by the humour of relating them symbolically, must plainly be the actions performed by those men here upon earth. Hence it will follow, that they who deem such actions a mere figurative history of astronomical revolutions erroneously brought down from the sphere into this nether world, and that they who would view them as *nothing more* than the operations of allegorical representations of physical objects set forth to us under the names of *Cybelè* or *Artemis* or *Hertha*, however they may have been enabled to satisfy *themselves* with their respective theories, directly contradict the most positive evidence which has come down to us from antiquity.

(2.) Matters being thus far established on direct evidence, the next question is: what particular men were venerated, as the hero-gods of the Gentiles.

Now the characters and actions of those hero-gods are so precisely the same in every part of

the globe, that the same dead men must inevitably have been adored as gods by the dispersed Gentiles in whatsoever regions they established themselves. For had they adored *different* dead men; had they severally, for instance, adored certain heroes of *their own particular* nations, with whom other tribes were unacquainted, and in whose history they were uninstructed: it is plain that the heroes of one people would, in point of character and actions, have been as dissimilar as possible to the heroes of another people[1]. The gods then of the Gentiles, wherever settled, being still the same deceased individuals; the worship of them must assuredly have commenced, *previous* to the dispersion of the Gentiles, and *during the time* that they were united in a single community. Hence it will of course follow, that, with some trifling local exceptions, the deceased individuals in question flourished *before* the era of the dispersion.

With this conclusion the testimony of the Gentiles themselves will be found once more exactly to accord.

Hesiod assures us, that the demon-gods were originally men, who flourished upon earth during the period of the golden age[2]. But the

[1] The poet says indeed, that *heroes are all alike:* but I need scarcely remark, that he and I do not use the word *hero* in the same sense.

[2] Hesiod. Oper. et Dier. lib. i. ver. 108—125.

golden age was that, which immediately succeeded the commencement of each new mundane system[1]. The demon-gods therefore, if we admit the chronological arrangement of Hesiod which approves itself to be accurate for the reasons already stated, must have been those men, who successively flourished immediately after the Mosaical creation and immediately after the general deluge. But, if such an opinion be well founded, the history of the demon-gods, however in some particulars it may be disguised by symbolizing fiction, will evidently appear in its great outline to be the history of those early individuals: and, as the individuals themselves were thought to have been translated to the heavenly bodies, it will obviously follow; both that their history would be written upon the sphere, and that their actions would be ascribed to their sidereal representatives. The whole therefore is now reduced to the simple question: whether the history of the demon-gods, as universally received by the Gentiles, *does* or *does not* tally with the history of those early individuals, whom we have been thus led to esteem their prototypes?

I shall satisfy myself with a single illustration: for, after what I have elsewhere written on the

[1] See Origin of Pagan Idol. book i. chap. 1. § I. 3. book iii. chap. 1.

subject, it were plainly superfluous to walk over the whole ground afresh [1].

The chief demon-god then of the Gentiles is said to have sailed in a ship with seven companions over the ocean, when at a remote era it inundated the whole earth. But this demon-god, in reference to his quitting the world and his reappearing in it at the commencement of each new system, is indifferently said, to have been translated to the Sun, to have been the child of the Sun, and to have been the Sun himself. Hence a notion prevailed, that the earliest king of Egypt was the Sun, who reigned in that country on the banks of the Nile immediately after the deluge; and that this solar monarch sailed over the sea in a ship with seven companions, venerated in succeeding ages as the great gods of the country [2]. At the same time, a notion equally prevailed, that the earliest king of Egypt was a man denominated *Menes:* and this man, during a period of extensive inundation, is said to have been preserved and to have been conveyed safe to land on the back of a crocodile [3].

[1] See Horæ Mosaic. book i. sect. i. chap. 3. chap. 4. § XII. XIII. chap. 5. § I. And Origin of Pagan Idol. passim.

[2] Diod. Bibl. lib. i. p. 13. Asiat. Res. vol. iii. p. 157. Clem. Alex. Strom. lib. v. p. 566. Jamb. de Myster. sect. vii. p. 151. Porphyr. de antro nymph. p. 256. Plutarch. de Isid. § 13, 14, 15. Herod. Hist. lib. ii. c. 145.

[3] Herod. Hist. lib. ii. c. 4. According to Diodorus, Menes

Now, if we put these two stories together, we shall immediately perceive, that the Sun and Menes must be the same person, and that the voyage of the former must be identified with the voyage of the latter: whence, knowing the Egyptian humour of expressing things by hieroglyphics, we should naturally conclude, even if we had no direct proof, that the crocodile of Menes was the ship of the Sun. But we have no occasion merely to draw inferences, however probable: we are assured, that the Egyptians employed the same word *Campsa* to denote both *an ark* and *a crocodile;* whence it is sufficiently manifest, that the aquatic crocodile was used as the symbol of a ship[1]. The voyage then of

was driven into the inundation by his dogs while engaged in hunting. Diod. Bibl. lib. i. p. 80. This however is but the same story told in the phraseology of the Mysteries. The dogs of the great deep were conspicuous portents in the Orgies, whether celebrated by the Babylonians, the Egyptians, the Greeks, or the Celts. See Origin of Pagan Idol, book iii. chap. 6. § III. 3.

[1] Herod. Hist. lib. ii. c. 69. Καμψα, θηκη. Hesych. Lex. The two ideas of *the ship* and *the crocodile* were sometimes curiously blended together. *The Egyptians*, says Montfaucon, *placed the image of the Sun in a ship, which was carried by a crocodile. It had seven mariners in it: its prow was adorned with the sculptured similitude of a cat: the mast was decorated with a lion's head: and the external part bore the resemblance of a crocodile.* Montf. Supplem. vol. ii. p. 230. To the same purpose speaks Eusebius; omitting however some of the more minute particulars, but adding that this ship of the Sun denoted the motion of the god in moisture: the true meaning of

the Sun and the voyage of Menes, each the fabled earliest sovereign of Egypt, was the same event: and it is described, as having taken place in this nether world.

Let us next see, whether we can observe any traces of such a voyage inscribed upon the sphere. With respect to this particular, the Sun, which is declared by the Egyptians to have received the soul of the dead Osiris who himself (like Menes) sailed over the waters in

which, when stripped of its physiological veil, is, that that ancient prince, who was venerated in the solar orb and who was decorated with the solar title, once moved in a ship through the element of water. Ἡλιον δε σημαινουσι, ποτε μεν δὶ ανθρωπου επιβεβηκοτος πλοιον, του πλοιου επι κροκοδειλε κειμενου. Δηλοι δε το μεν πλοιον, την εν ὑγρῳ κινησιν. Præp. Evan. lib. iii. c. 8. p, 69. Doubtless the person thus represented is he, who is said by Diodorus to have been the earliest king of Egypt and to have been denominated *Helius* or *the Sun.* Πρῶτον μεν ἥλιον βασιλευσαι των κατ' Αιγυπτον, ὁμωνυμον οντα τῳ κατ' ουρανον αστρῳ. Died. Bybl. lib. i. p. 13. His mystic consort was Selenè or the Moon: but by this Moon, of which the naviform lunar crescent was the astronomical symbol, was meant that floating Moon or boat shaped like a lunette, in which the solar Osiris was annually set afloat on the river Ocean of Egypt. Hence Plutarch remarks: Ἡλιον δε και Σελὴνην, ουχ ἁρμασιν, αλλα πλοιοις, οχημασι χρωμενους, περιπλειν αει. Plut. de Isid. § 34. The crocodile was also a symbol of Typhon: but the leading idea is still the same. For Typhon was a personification of the sea: and the great God of the Gentiles was represented, sometimes sailing in a ship, and sometimes floating on the ocean either in the cup of the lotos or on the back of the great serpent. Plut. de Isid. § 50, 40, 32.

an ark, is fabled astronomically to be the pilot of the immense ship of the Universe: while the seven planets, viewed as members of the same celestial family, are given to him as subordinate mariners [1].

Thus it appears, that we have, first a voyage of a very ancient hero-god, performed in a ship with seven companions over the waters of a general deluge; next a voyage of the Sun, performed also in a ship with the seven great gods upon the surface of that very ocean which flows round our habitable globe; and lastly a voyage of the Sun, still performed in a ship with seven companions, but performed through the liquid fields of ether with the seven planets.

These several legends are manifestly connected. How then are we to understand them? Shall we say, that no such voyage ever took place in this world, but that the allegorical voyage of the solar system has been brought down from heaven to earth? If thus we say, we shall agree indeed with Mr. Volney, but we shall directly contradict all historical testimony whether sacred or profane [2]: yet so we *must* say, if we adopt the theory, that the deeds of the hero-gods were never performed upon earth, but that they truly relate to nothing more than

[1] Martian. Capell. Satyric. lib. ii. p. 43.

[2] Some extraordinary discoveries of Mr. Volney may be seen in his work entitled *the Ruins*. Notes. p. 282, 315, 316.

the revolutions of the celestial bodies. Shall we confess, that such a voyage *was* once accomplished here below? Then, unless we run directly counter to the testimony of the Gentiles themselves; namely, that the man, who performed the voyage in this world, was thought to have been translated as a hero-god to the orb of the Sun: then we must allow, that the voyage of the man was *the prototype* of the voyage of the Sun; that the Sun was said to have sailed in a ship, either over the ocean or on the sphere, *because* his supposed animating regent, the deified man, has thus literally sailed in a ship; and, consequently, that an action, performed in this nether world, was inscribed upon the sphere, *because* the souls of the heroes were thought to be translated to the heavenly bodies.

The proof seems to be already as complete, as can well be desired: for, if the Sun be the astronomical representative of the chief hero-god, which he is positively declared to be; then the seven planetary companions of the Sun must, in the construction of the present fable, be the astronomical representatives of the seven maritime associates of the chief hero-god, while the ship of the sphere answers to the ship which bore the man over the ocean. But it will receive additional strength, if we bring into juxtaposition the mythologic systems of Egypt and Hindostan.

Though Paganism itself be ultimately the same, wherever professed; yet, from a closer national intercourse, the systems of some countries will have a greater mutual affinity than the systems of other countries. Now, through the early subjugation of Egypt by the Indo-Scythic Shepherds, we may naturally expect, that Egypt and Hindostan will stand very closely related in point of theology: and this we shall find to be the case[1]. *The Sun* and *the Sun-born Menu* of the latter country are evidently *the Sun* and *the Sun-connected Menes* of the former country: while the Indian *Iswara* and *Isi* with their ship *Argha* seem palpably to be the very same, as the Egyptian *Isiris* and *Isis* with their ship *Argo*. But the history of Menu proves him indisputably to be the scriptural Noah[2]. Therefore Menes, viewed as escaping from an inundation by means of a symbolical crocodile or a literal ark, must be Noah likewise. This ancient personage however is said to have been both translated *to* the Sun and to have proceeded *from* the Sun: and we are assured, that Iswara, like the Egyptian Isiris, is the Sun when viewed astronomically. But Iswara, like the man Menu, performs a voyage over the deluge in the ship Argha: and afterwards, when the waters abate, both he and his ship are trans-

[1] See Origin of Pagan Idol. book vi. chap. 5.

[2] See Horæ Mosaic. book i. sect. i. chap. 4. § IV.

formed into doves[1]. This tale stands self-explained. But the voyage of Iswara in his ship Argha is certainly the voyage of Isiris in his ship Argo. Therefore the voyage of Isiris is a voyage performed over the same deluge, as that upon which Menu floated with seven companions when a former world was destroyed by water.

On the whole, nothing appears to me more evident, than that Hero-worship was the cause of Sabianism, though the two sprang up almost synchronically; and, consequently, that poetical astronomy has inscribed upon the sphere the deeds of the hero-gods upon earth. Of this we have an illustrious instance in the constellation of that Argo, which here below bore the solar demon-god and his seven companions in safety over the great deep[2].

III. I have used the expression, that *Hero-worship was* THE CAUSE *of Sabianism:* an expression,

[1] See Asiat. Res. vol. vi. p. 523. and Horæ Mosaic. book i. sect. i. chap. 4. § XII. 1.

[2] See Horæ Mosaic. book i. sect. i. chap. 4. § XIV. and Origin of Pagan Idol. book iv. chap. 4. § I. 2. Plutarch expressly tells us, that the Argo of the sphere is the ship of Osiris: and his language clearly imports, that, in the judgment of the Egyptians, the ship was not borrowed from the constellation, but that the constellation was arranged in memory and in honour of the ship. Το πλοιον, ὁ καλουσιν Ἑλληνες Αργω, της Οσιριδος νεως ειδωλον επι τιμῃ κατηστερισμενον, ου μακραν φερεσθαι τοῦ Ωριωνος και του Κυνός, ὧν το μεν Ὡρου, τὸ δε Ισιδος ἱερον, Αιγυπτιοι νομιζουσι. Plut. de Isid. § 22.

which of necessity implies *the chronological priority* of Hero-worship; for *the cause* must always precede *the effect*. Many, however, have held a directly opposite opinion; and have contended, that Sabianism was more ancient than Hero-worship. Now, since the establishment of what I believe to be the truth will presently evince itself to be of no small importance to that main discussion, for which all these remarks on the theology of the Gentiles are only preparing the way; the present time will afford a fit opportunity for discussing the question before us.

1. My own argument, in favour of the priority of Hero-worship (which, as we shall soon find, is corroborated by the impossibility of rationally accounting for the rise of Pagan Idolatry, if we give the precedence to Sabianism), is simply this.

The gods of the Gentiles, as we are positively assured by those who had the best means of knowing, were certain dead men translated to heaven. But in what manner were they so translated? The general voice of antiquity bears witness, that they were translated to the Sun and to the Planets and to the Stars and to the Constellations. Hence, as the chief of these dead men (who received preëminent worship in the quality of the universal father) was thought to have taken his station in the orb of the Sun: so that glorious luminary, in consequence of its being esteemed his celestial vehicle, was con-

junctively venerated as the principal god of the Gentiles; while the Host of Heaven, on similar grounds, received similar and suitable honours. This notion was of the very highest antiquity, and it prevailed in the West even to the last age of idolatry: but THE MODE, in which it was held, implies of necessity, that Hero-worship *preceded* Sabianism. When the soul of the deified Cesar was feigned to be translated to a star; the star was revered, not *simply and independently*, but *because it was the supposed vehicle of the new god*. The worship therefore of the man clearly PRECEDED the worship of the Star; for the one was, in truth, THE CAUSE of the other.

What applies to the canonization of Cesar equally applies to the canonization of the more ancient hero-gods.

It was a prevailing idea, that the Sun, the Moon, and the Stars, were not mere inert matter; but that they were beings, wise, intelligent, and actuated by a divine spirit[1]. Posidonius tells us, that the Stoics supposed each Star to be *the body* of a deity: and Austin represents them as maintaining, that the Stars were all living creatures, and that they had all rational souls[2]. The same notion prevailed among the Phenicians: for I think it abundantly evident, that the intelligent oviform ani-

[1] Zen. apud Stob.

[2] Posid. apud Stob. August. de Civ. Dei. lib. iv. c. 11.

mals, which Sanchoniatho calls *Zophesemin* or *Overlookers of the heavens*, are no other than the Stars[1]. We find it also among the ancient Babylonians: for, in the Chaldèan Oracles, the great father is said to have constituted a septenary of erratic living animals, which are the seven Worlds or seven Planets[2]. From the Gentiles, most probably during the time of the captivity, these speculations passed even to the Jews[3]. Philo calls the Stars *divine images:* and, in what sense he calls them so, appears from his also denominating them *incorruptible and immortal souls*[4]. So likewise Maimonides declares, that the Stars and Spheres are every one of them animated; being endued with life, and knowledge, and understanding[5].

[1] Euseb. Præp. Evan. lib. i. c. 10.

[2] Fran. Patric. Orac. Zoroast. tit. Ουρανος. p. 44.

[3] The Rabbins were probably the more inclined to adopt such speculations from some perverse exposition of Job xxxviii. 7. *When the morning-stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy.*

[4] Phil. de opif. mund. Phil. de somn.

[5] Jesude Hattor. c. iii. § 9. apud Cudw. Intell. Syst. p. 471. Of all the sacred writers, none delights so much in allusions to the mythology of the Gentiles as the prophet Isaiah. Hence we find him referring, with sufficient distinctness, to the very ancient doctrine, that the souls of kings, and heroes and illustrious men were translated after death to the stars; in consequence of which translation, the stars themselves came to be viewed as animated intelligences. The defunct king of Babylon, in the usual strain of demonolatrous adulation, had been placed, like the Cesar of a later

The heavenly bodies then were plainly venerated, not as mere inert matter, but as instinct

age, in the brilliant morning star. To this circumstance Isaiah refers in a strain of bitter triumph, while describing with wonderful energy the unhonoured descent of the disembodied royal soul to the realms of Hades. *How art thou fallen from heaven, O lucifer, son of the morning! How art thou cut down to the ground, thou which didst weaken the nations! For thou hast said in thine heart, I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God: I will sit also upon the mount of the congregation, in the sides of the north: I will ascend above the heights of the clouds: I will be like the Most High. Yet thou shalt be brought down to Hades, to the sides of the pit.* Isaiah xiv. 12—15. By *the mount of the congregation in the sides of the north,* is meant the Paradisiacal mount of the ark in northern Armenia, the prototype of the Greek Olympus, the Indian Meru, and the Gothic Ida. Of this sacred mount, the Babylonian temple-tower of Belus, fashioned with its eight gradually diminishing stages upon the exact fabulous model of the holy mount Meru or Ida-Vratta, was a local transcript: and, in the sacellum upon its summit, the apotheosis of the departed monarch had most probably been celebrated. It was from this same mythologic principle, if I mistake not, that the host of heaven was employed in the language of hieroglyphics, and thence also in the language of figured prophecy, to denote kings and princes and grandees. The matter is very curiously and accurately set forth by Horapollo. Αστηρ, παρ' Αιγυπτιοις, γραφομενος, ποτε μεν θεον σημαινει, ποτε δε ψυχην ανθρωπου αρρενος. *Among the Egyptians, a star, when depicted, means, one while a god, another while the soul of a masculine human being.* Horapoll. Hierog. lib. ii. § 1. The soul of the masculine hero, when canonized, was thought to occupy a star as its future vehicle: hence a star was naturally made the hieroglyphic of a demon-god or of a masculine soul.

with living souls. Hence THE CAUSE of their receiving worship was doubtless their supposed animation. Had they *not* been deemed thus animated, they would never have been adored at all. The question therefore is, who or what were those intelligent souls, which were thought to preside over their several orbs?

Now the plain reason, why the heavenly bodies were thus deemed living intelligences, was their supposed union with the souls of deceased heroes: and, as the Sun was the brightest of those bodies, it was naturally thought the peculiar residence of the parent and chief of the hero-gods. This opinion was strenuously held by the Platonists of the Alexandrian school. All the superior gods, by a mystic *theocrasia*, they equally esteemed the Sun: while they imagined the inferior gods to be deified heroes, whose souls dwelt in the bodies of the stars[1]. In this doctrine they are fully supported by the whole tenor of ancient mythology. The Egyptian priests, as we learn from Plutarch, taught expressly, that all their principal deities were once mere men; but that, after they died, their souls migrated into some one or other of the heavenly bodies, and became the genii or animating spirits of their new celestial mansions[2]. In a similar manner,

[1] Plot. Ennead. ii. lib. 9.

[2] Plut. de Isid. § 21.

we are told by Sanchoniatho, that Ilus or Cronus was once a man, that he was deified by the Phenicians after his death, and that his soul was believed to have passed into the Planet which bears his name[1]. So again, among the Hindoos (to say nothing of the solar Menu himself), the seven Rishis, who were preserved in an ark with Satyavrata, now animate the seven Stars of the great Bear; while the souls of their wives shine conspicuously in the Pleiades[2]. These were the gods, whom the Latins called *Deastri*, because their residence was in the Stars. They were thought to have been once illustrious men: but it was supposed, that their souls after death, mounted to the Constellations as a reward of their exalted virtue.

Do we ask then, WHY the heavenly bodies were venerated? The answer is clear: they were venerated, not *independently*, but BECAUSE *they were thought to be animated by the souls of the defunct hero-gods*. If then this imaginary animation was THE CAUSE of their receiving divine honours, the worship of the hero-gods must clearly have PRECEDED the worship of their mere inert vehicles the heavenly bodies.

Yet, while I thus give the priority to Hero-worship, I am far from viewing the question as it has commonly been viewed. The dispute is

[1] Euseb. Præp. Evan. lib. i. c. 10.

[2] Asiat. Res. vol. ix. p. 83, 85. Moor's Hind. Panth. p. 86.

usually conducted, as if it were only by *the gradual lapse of time* that Hero-worship and Sabianism became blended together; the one being *long prior* to the other, whichever of the two ought to be deemed the most ancient. But this is a mistake. The uniformity of Paganism in things arbitrary, wheresoever it may be the established religion, proves it to have been excogitated when all mankind were united in a single community: for on no other ground can we satisfactorily account for this striking uniformity, whether India or Egypt or Greece or Italy or Britain or Scythia or America be the country where it prevails. Such being the case, Hero-worship and Sabianism must have been blended into one system *previous* to the dispersion from Babel: and consequently the two, whether separated or united, must have been in existence *before* that era. Hence, whichever may be the more ancient superstition, it cannot very long have preceded the other[1].

2. The old Phenician writer Sanchoniatho has, however, been sometimes adduced to prove by direct evidence, that the worship of the heavenly bodies was *prior* to the worship of heroes: because he states, that Genus and Genea, who stand in his *second* generation of men, adored the Sun as the only lord of heaven;

[1] See Origin of Pagan Idol. Preface and book i. chap. 1. § IV.

while Chrysor, whom he identifies with Phtha or Hephestus and who stands in the *seventh* generation, is said to be the first person who was revered after his death as a god. Here, it is contended, we have direct pagan evidence as to *the priority of Sabianism.*

(1.) On this I would remark, that, even if we admit the evidence to be valid, it is perfectly irrelevant to the point under litigation.

The dispute respects, not *antediluvian*, but *postdiluvian*, idolatry: and the real question is, *whether the children of Noah, when they apostatised from orthodox Patriarchism, lapsed first into Sabianism or into Hero-worship.*

Now, though Sanchoniatho does not expressly mention the flood, and though there is some degree of confusion in the arrangement of his generations: yet, since we find *low down* in the genealogy certain characters who are plainly Noah and Ham and Canaan, we may be sure that the *earlier* steps in that genealogy must needs be *antediluvian.* Such therefore is plainly the case with the *second* generation, where he places the rise of Sabianism. It is the generation of Cain and Abel and Seth: for it is the generation, next to that of the first man and woman. Hence, whether Sanchoniatho be right or wrong in his assertion, he speaks altogether of the rise, not of *postdiluvian*, but of *antediluvian*, Sabianism. His statement, consequently, does

not bear in the slightest degree upon the matter in hand.

(2.) But, while his assertion relative to the origin of Sabianism is thus palpably irrelevant, nothing can be more clear, when we descend lower in the genealogy, than that he makes *postdiluvian* Hero-worship *precede* and (exactly as I have myself stated the matter) be in fact THE CAUSE of *postdiluvian* Sabianism.

Viewed under different aspects, Noah certainly appears in the table more than once; and this confusion mainly springs from the circumstance of his having sustained the two-fold character of an antediluvian and a postdiluvian: as the Phenicians however were a colony of Indo-Scythians, I am inclined to think, that the genealogical system of Hindostan will throw some light on that recorded by Sanchoniatho[1].

According to the Hindoos, there were seven primeval Menus: the first of whom, denominated *Adim* and styled *the son of the Self-existent*, is undoubtedly the scriptural *Adam*; while the seventh, who constructs a large ship and who performs in it the earliest recorded voyage over the waters of an universal deluge, is assuredly the scriptural Noah. Closely analogous to the seven Menus are the seven primeval generations of Phenician mythology. The first generation

[1] See Origin of Pagan Idol. book vi. chap. 5. § V. 2.

comprehends the two earliest mortals, *Protogonus* and *Eon*, as their names are expressed by the Greek translator of Sanchoniatho; of which names, *Protogonus* is a literal version of the Sanscrit title *Adim* borne by Menu-Swayambhuva: and the seventh generation is that of a famous mechanic, denominated Chrysor; whom Sanchoniatho identifies with Hephestus or Vulcan, who was the first of all men that sailed over the sea, and who after his death was the first that was worshipped as a hero-god under the name of *Diamichius* or *Zeus-Michius* or *The divine engineer*. This identical person was venerated by the Egyptians, who at an early period were conquered by the Phenician or Indo-Scythic Shepherds, as the oldest of their eight great gods whom they represented sailing together in a ship: and Pherecydes informs us, that he espoused Cabira the daughter of Ocean, by whom he became the parent of the three Cabiri and the three Cabiræ [1]. But the Cabiri are said by Sanchoniatho to have been the children of Sydyk or the Just Man: and he asserts, that they were the builders of the first ship, and that they consecrated at Berytus the re-

[1] Origin of Pagan Idol. book vi. chap. 5. Herod. Hist. lib. ii. c. 145. lib. iii. c. 37. Jamb. de Myster. sect. viii. c. 3. Porph. apud Euseb. Præp. Evan. lib. iii. c. 11. Hermap. apud Marcellin. lib. xxii. c. 15. Porph. de ant. nymph. p. 256. Pherec. apud Strab. Geog. lib. x. p. 472. Hesych. Lex. Pan and Hephestus were the same person under different names.

mains of the sea. Chrysor then and Sydyk must be the same person under different names: and that person must evidently, I think, be no other than the Indian Menu-Satyavrata and the scriptural Noah. The same great patriarch appears again in Sanchoniatho's genealogy under the appellations of *Agruerus* and *Ilus* and *Dagon*, each of whom is said to have lived a man upon earth and to have been worshipped as a god after his death.

As Sanchoniatho then asserts, that Chrysor or the seventh Menu or Noah was the first deified mortal; and since he is here speaking of the rise of *postdiluvian* idolatry: he certainly makes *postdiluvian* idolatry commence with *Hero-worship* in the person of Noah. For, whatever may have been the nature of *antediluvian* idolatry; we are sure, that, *immediately* after the flood, there was no religion in the world save the genuine patriarchal worship of Jehovah.

Having thus declared Noah or Chrysor to be the first deified mortal, Sanchoniatho goes on to state, how the several members of the Sydykian or Ilian or Noëtic family were all after their death exalted to the rank of hero-gods; clearly and very accurately representing such superstition as the *earliest* idolatry which was established among the descendants of Noah or Sydyk or Ilus.

We have now seen the rise of *postdiluvian* Hero-worship, while as yet nothing is said re-

lative to its connection with Sabianism. But, if we advance a little further in the narrative, we shall soon find, that this latter also makes its appearance: and *that* too, *in the very same order*, and *after the very same mode*, and *in the very same connection*, as I have supposed and maintained.

According to Sanchoniatho; who (be it observed) was no speculative theorist, but who wrote his narrative from the sacred records attributed to Thoth and the Cabiri and carefully preserved in his native town Berytus: according to Sanchoniatho, these deified mortals were FIRST worshipped *simply;* but AFTERWARD the adoration of them was *connected with astronomy*, and then commenced the *postdiluvian* veneration of the heavenly bodies.

Now the *mode* of this connection most assuredly implies *the* PRIORITY *of Hero-worship*. Ilus or Cronus, we are told, though truly a man, was worshipped as a god: here we have *naked Demonolatry*. But, after his death, he was thought to be translated to the planet which from one of his titles is still denominated *Saturn;* and henceforth he was venerated as the regent of that planet, while the planet itself was viewed as his sidereal body or as his celestial residence: here we have *Demonolatry expanding into Sabianism*.

Such is the statement of these early matters, which is given us by Sanchoniatho: and, from

the evidence afforded by this statement, it is perfectly clear, that the heavenly bodies were not adored by the postdiluvians *independently* and *abstractedly*, but *complexly as the vehicles or mansions of the beatified hero-gods.* Whence it will follow, that, if they BORROWED their divinity from the divinity of the hero-gods; or, in other words, if they were worshipped BECAUSE the souls of the hero-gods were thought to be translated to them: postdiluvian Hero-worship must have been PRIOR to postdiluvian Sabianism, just as the cause must be PRIOR to the effect.

It is worthy of remark (though I have already had occasion to notice the circumstance), that the Egyptians, according to Plutarch, were exactly in the same story. They venerated the Host of Heaven, BECAUSE the souls of their hero-gods were supposed to be translated after death to the Sun and the Moon and the Stars[1].

[1] Plut. de Isid. § 21. I shall give the original passage, on account of its importance and remarkable precision. Ου μονον δε τουτου (scil. Οσιριδος) οἱ ἱερεις λεγουσιν, αλλα και των αλλων θεων, ὁσοι μη αγωνιστοι μηδε αφθαρτοι, τα μεν σωματα παρ' αυτοις κεισθαι καμοντα και θεραπευεσθαι, τας δε ψυχας εν ουρανῳ λαμπειν αστρα, και καλεισθαι Κυνα μεν την Ισιδος ὑφ' Ἑλλήνων, ὑπ' Αιγυπτιων δε Σωθιν, Ωριωνα δε την Ὡρω, την δε Τυφωνος Αρκτον. Plutarch is indeed very unwilling himself to admit this doctrine, lest it should sanction the bold declarations of Euhemerus that the gods of the Gentiles were merely successful generals and admirals and kings, and should thus introduce that atheism which the pagans were wont to ascribe to the early Christians: but still he honestly gives the doctrine, as

Nothing, in short, can be more explicit, than the declaration of Sanchoniatho himself relative to the earliest postdiluvian idolatry. It consisted, he assures us, in the worship of deified men, who for the most part were remarkable rather for their vices than for their virtues: an assertion strictly true, as relating to Ham and Canaan and Cush and Nimrod[1].

it was set forth by the Egyptian priesthood. Now, that it was *in truth* their established doctrine, is abundantly plain from the fact recorded by him, that the inhabitants of the Thebais were exempted from the general contribution levied for the maintenance of the sacred animals, on the express ground, that they would allow no mortal man to be a god; venerating him only, as unproduced and immortal, whom they denominated *Cneph*. *Μονους δε μη διδοναι τους Θηβαϊδα κατοικουντας, ὡς θνητον θεον ουδενα νομιζοντας, αλλα ὁν καλουσιν αυτοι Κνηφ, αγεννητον οντα και αθανατον.* § 21. Unless the Egyptians in general had esteemed their gods to be deified mortals, the inhabitants of the Thebais could not have objected to their doctrine, nor could they have reasonably claimed to be exempt from contributing to the maintenance of the sacred animals. These animals were all viewed, as incarnations or avatars of the hero-gods: the bull, of Osiris; the ram, of Ammon; the goat, of Mendes; the fish, of Athar or Oenus; the ibis, of Thoth. Hence those, who rejected the divinity of the hero-gods, consistently refused also to venerate their bestial representatives.

[1] *Ὁ δε προϋων, ὁ τον επι παντων Θεον, ουδε μην τους κατ' ουρανον,* ΘΝΗΤΟΥΣ ΔΕ ΑΝΔΡΑΣ ΚΑΙ ΓΥΝΑΙΚΑΣ, *ουδε τον τροπον αστειους, διοις δι' αρετην αξιον ειναι αποδεξασθαι η ζηλωσαι της φιλοσοφιας, φαυλοτητος δε και μοχθηριας απασης κακιαν περιβεβλημενους θεολογει. Και μαρτυρει δε τουτους αυτους εκεινους ειναι, τους εισετι και νυν θεους παρα τοις πασι νενομισμενους κατα τε τας πολεις και τας χωρας.* Euseb. Præp. Evan. lib. i. c. 10. p. 20.

3. What then shall we say, as to the assertion of Sanchoniatho respecting the very early rise of Sabianism among the *antediluvians?* For, whether he be warranted or not in making such an assertion, he doubtless represents Sabianism as the *earliest* form of *antediluvian* idolatry.

His account of the matter is this. In the second generation, during a time of great drought, Genus and Genea, who (as Bishop Cumberland well observes) seem to be Cain and Caina expressed Hellenistically, stretched forth their hands to heaven in adoration of the Sun; for they judged him to be Beel-Samin or the lord of the heavens. Afterward, in the fifth generation, two pillars were consecrated to the elements of Fire and Wind. And at length, when the authors of this idolatry were dead, similar pillars with trunks of trees were dedicated to them, and their memory was preserved by anniversary feasts.

Here, no doubt, Sabianism is made to *precede* Demonolatry: and the tradition of the Jews, as set forth by Maimonides, is not very dissimilar.

In the days of Enos the son of Seth, says he, *men fell into grievous errors: and even Enos himself partook of their infatuation. Their language was, that, Since God had placed on high the heavenly bodies and used them as his ministers, it was evidently his will, that they should receive from men the same veneration as the servants of a great prince*

justly claim from the subject multitude. Impressed with this notion, they began to build temples to the Stars, to sacrifice to them, and to worship them; in the vain expectation, that they should please the Creator of all things. At first indeed, they did not suppose the Stars to be the only deities; but adored, in conjunction with them, the Lord God Omnipotent. In process of time however, that great and venerable name was totally forgotten: and the whole human race retained no other religion than the idolatrous worship of the Host of Heaven[1].

(1.) This statement of Maimonides is plainly founded upon a text in Genesis, which, as it stands in our English version, conveys to the mind no very satisfactory information.

And to Seth, to him also, there was born a son; and he called his name Enos: then began men to call upon the name of the Lord[2].

It may well seem not a little strange, that there should be no worship of Jehovah until the birth of Enos; and, what is still worse, we have a direct contradiction to a former part of the sacred history, which describes the offering up of a solemn sacrifice to God by Cain and Abel: but both the marvel and the contradiction exist only in our common translation. Maimonides rightly drew from this text a directly opposite conclusion: he learned from it, not that *men*

[1] Maimon. de Idol. cited in Dissert. on the Cabiri. vol. i. p. 10.

[2] Gen. iv. 26.

began in the days of Enos to call upon the name of the Lord, but that *in the days of Enos men fell into grievous errors*. Hence he must have rendered the passage, as it certainly ought to be rendered; *Then there was pollution in calling upon the name of Jehovah:* that is to say, *Men called upon Jehovah after a corrupt or apostatical manner*. This pollution Maimonides supposed to consist in worshipping the heavenly bodies conjunctively with God: but Scripture is silent, as to its precise modification; the inspired writer simply teaches us, that there was pollution of some description or other in calling upon the name of Jehovah which then commenced. Such being the case, we can only learn the precise nature of the pollution by inquiring into the nature of Cain's apostasy. Whether the antediluvians did or did not worship the heavenly bodies, we are no where positively told in Scripture; though both the Phenician and the Hebrew tradition teaches us, that they did.

(2.) Now, as I have already stated and as I shall hereafter shew more at large, the apostasy of Cain, with which the antediluvians were by degrees universally tainted, consisted in a rejection of the atonement through the predicted bruising or sacrificial devotement of the woman's seed: and this speedily led to every evil imagination of the thoughts of man's heart [1]. Having

[1] See above book i. chap. 1. § I. 1. and below book i. chap. 7. See also Horæ Mosaic. book ii. sect. iii. chap. 2. § I. 2.

in the pride of their high speculations rejected the merciful counsel of God, Cain and his imitators were judicially given up to the blindness of a corrupt mind, so that they should believe their own lie however preposterous.

The substance of this lie, when the traditions respecting the nature of antediluvian idolatry are considered, I take to have been a certain unhallowed philosophizing on the nature of God, which at length introduced a system of rank Materialism. Jehovah was pronounced to be a pantheus: and all things were determined to be only parts of the varied Deity. A God without any atonement was propounded as the rational object of philosophic devotion: and that God was plausibly viewed, as existing through universal nature, as manifesting himself under a thousand different forms, and as perpetually meeting either the eye or the touch in this or in that modification.

From such a theory would of course result the worship *both* of the heavenly bodies and of the elements; not however as *distinct* gods presiding over the frame of nature, but as *members* and *parts* of the infinitely diversified pantheus.

If such then were the theologic system of the antediluvians after their rejection of the atonement (and I think we may gather, that something not very dissimilar to it prevailed among them); we shall at once see the force and the import of the remark, that *in the days of Enos*

there was pollution in calling upon the name of Jehovah. Under the plea of a refined and philosophical worship, which professedly struck at the very object of the Patriarchal Dispensation, his holy name was ascribed to his own mere handywork: and, in thus worshipping the creature *as identified with* the Creator, while the revelation of the Creator himself was daringly rejected, a gross pollution took place in the invocation of his name.

I will venture to add, that *in this manner alone* could the worship of the heavenly bodies spring up BEFORE Hero-worship in a society, *which had not previously lost all knowledge of the true God.* The *naked* worship of the Sun and Moon and Stars, that is to say, *the worship of them as proper and distinct deities,* can never have been EARLIER than Hero-worship, *unless mankind had* FIRST *lost the knowledge of the true God and had sunk into the gross ignorance of absolute barbarism.* But the worship of the heavenly bodies, *on the principles of the Material system,* is not (be it observed) *proper* Sabianism: for, in the first place, they are not, on the principles of *that* system, worshipped EXCLUSIVELY but only CONJUNCTIVELY with the whole frame of nature; and, in the second place, still on the principles of the Material system, they are not worshipped as SEPARATE gods but as the varied members or portions of the supposed ONE true God. The *materialized* worship of them may therefore have

easily sprung from, what Moses describes as, a polluted mode of invocating Jehovah: but, if the *Sabian* or *exclusive* worship of them were the EARLIEST idolatry, it is impossible in the very nature of things, that it could have sprung, *direct* and *without any intervention of barbarous ignorance*, from the patriarchal worship of the One Supreme Being. Mankind must have *lost* all knowledge of the true God, before they could *thus* plunge into Sabianism.

4. Of the truth of this last position Bishop Warburton was quite aware. Hence, as he pronounces Sabianism to have been the most ancient form of postdiluvian idolatry; we find him conducting mankind to it, through what is assuredly the only possible medium of approach: that is to say, *through the medium of such gross previous barbarism as should have caused a total loss of the knowledge of the one true God.*

Fully convinced however as I am, that Hero-worship was the first step from postdiluvian Patriarchism into postdiluvian idolatry, and that the common notion of the higher antiquity of Sabianism is a mere vulgar error even though advocated by such a man as Bishop Warburton; I shall yet, for the more complete discussion of the subject, exhibit a system regularly drawn out, in which the priority is given to Sabianism: that so the utter untenability of that opinion may the more distinctly appear. The system,

which I select, is that of no ordinary man; for it is the system of the great prelate, whom I have just mentioned. If therefore the difficulties, which attend it, cannot be surmounted by the master-hand of a Warburton; we may be tolerably sure, that the exertions of any inferior retainer will only be so much lost labour.

The early descendants of Noah, says the bishop, *soon lost the revealed knowledge of their Creator; which, though indeed revived by an extraordinary dispensation of Providence, was however confined within the gates of a single family: while the rest of mankind, partly by too great a confidence in that unfaithful guardian of truth Tradition, and partly by too little attention to the better instructor Reason, fell into the most senseless idolatries.*

For, living at first scattered abroad in independent tribes, their gross untutored minds could rise no higher than to the sensible causes of good and evil; the most considerable of which being the elements and heavenly bodies, they became the first object of their worship and veneration. And, having experienced them to be, sometimes the authors of health and plenty, and sometimes again of pestilence and famine, they from thence began to entertain an opinion of good and evil demons.

But, being now collected into bodies and formed into communities, the sudden supplial of all the wants of life, which followed, was so sensibly understood, that mistaken gratitude took another channel, and

turned as strongly on their deceased lawgivers, the generous procurers of this their improved condition; whom they soon venerated and exalted into gods.

But, as civil life introduced and encouraged the culture of the mind as well as of the body, both the first and second mode of worship were, from their manifest absurdities, in danger of falling under the popular contempt. To prevent this mischief, the legislator diverted the steady attention to either, by confounding them together, making Elementary and Hero-worship representative of one another, and then laying on a new cover over both by the invention of a third species of idolatry symbolical of the other two. But a further account of this matter, and how the two original and simple forms produced that more monstrous compound; in which, first of all brutes, and then stocks and stones, were worshipped: from what accidents of error, from what contrivances of fraud, these prodigies arose; which have since given so much exercise to the learned: all this is without the limits of the present discourse[1]. *Let it suffice to observe, that St. Paul hath not aggravated the case, where, in his epistle to the Romans, he says: that the gentile world had changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and to four-footed beasts, and to creeping things*[2].

[1] See Div. Leg. book iv.

[2] Sermons. vol. ix. serm. V. p. 97, 98.

(1.) With every writer, who endeavours to elucidate the theology of the Gentiles, one grand point must always be *to account satisfactorily for its* FIRST *origination.*

The bare fact of *its existence* is incontrovertible: the bare fact likewise, that *the primeval inhabitants of the world during a certain indefinite period after the deluge were sound worshippers of the alone true God,* is equally incontrovertible with all those who admit the authority of revelation. The question therefore is, *how idolatry* AT ALL *sprang up among a race of faithful worshippers, when it was impossible that they should be tainted by the contagion of bad example.*

This difficulty was felt by Bishop Warburton in common with others: and, as Sabianism was, according to his theory, the most ancient modification of postdiluvian idolatry, he found it necessary to account for *its origination* among a race of men, who had confessedly been trained up in the worship of Jehovah, and who had been taught that the various heavenly bodies were but the work of his hands. How then does he solve the problem of *such men ever* BEGINNING *to adore the Sun and the Moon and the Planets and the Stars, when this peculiar form of idolatry no where presented itself to their eyes in actual existence?* By what process of the human mind was it, that the worship of the Host of Heaven either superseded, or was superadded to, the worship of Jehovah?

The bishop contends, that *the early descendants of Noah soon lost the revealed knowledge of their Creator*, which was not recovered until the call of Abraham[1]: and he further contends, that, when they were dispersed over the face of the earth, they universally degenerated into the brutal stupidity of the savage state. This barbarism, the knowledge of the true God being now obliterated, prepared the way for the rise of idolatry: and, as the heavenly bodies could be seen, and as their benefits could be felt, the Sun and the Celestial Host would naturally be

[1] It is somewhat curious, that, by a careless writer who has evidently never studied the subject, I should have been strangely misrepresented, as advocating, in my *Origin of Pagan Idolatry*, this identical opinion of Bishop Warburton: when the very mode, in which I account for the origination of Hero-worship, is built upon *the directly opposite theory*, that Hero-worship was engrafted upon the adoration of the TRUE God; which adoration of the TRUE God LONG remained, though under a corrupt modification. See Origin of Pag. Idol. book vi. chap. 6. The notion, that mankind should SUDDENLY lose all knowledge of Jehovah, and that they should agree to worship deified mortals EXCLUSIVELY and IN HIS ROOM, is truly a very *singular* notion, as it has rightly enough been denominated by this person: but, since it has never been advanced by *myself*, and since my whole hypothesis requires the admission of the *directly opposite* opinion; I am of course no way answerable for its *singularity*. AFTERWARD indeed, and THROUGH LAPSE OF TIME, the knowledge of the true God was lost among the Gentiles: but it is plainly impossible, that it should have been ABRUPTLY lost in the *first* instance.

the FIRST deities of savage ignorance. To these, on the same grounds, would be added the Elements: and, as such objects would present themselves under an exactly similar aspect to the dispersed tribes wherever they might be established, Sabianism and the worship of the Elements would be the OLDEST idolatry in every part of the world[1].

[1] In another place, the bishop, not quite consistently, styles this imagined savage state *a state of nature:* and, from the inconveniences which men felt while existing in it, he deduces the origin of civil government. See Div. Leg. book i. sect. 2. His theory does not seem to me to rest upon evidence. To call a savage state *a state of nature* is indeed to speak the language of pagan speculatists, but it is not to speak the language of Scripture. According to Holy Writ (and from this source alone can we learn, with any certainty, the transactions of the first ages), man's state of nature was not a savage, but a regularly social, state. Society therefore, if we speak of its origin in *general* terms (as the bishop does) and not in *particular* terms (as it may have haply commenced in this country or in that country), did *not* spring from the necessities of savage life; which of course implies the absurd position, that God first created men brutal savages, and that by degrees they licked themselves into social order and decency: but it was coëval with the existence of the first family, and may well be supposed to have been ordained by God himself. Springing then as it did from the constitution of a single family, it assumed what has been called *the patriarchal form:* and this form it retained universally after the deluge, until the regular patriarchal succession was broken in upon by the military violence of Nimrod. After the dispersion, the old form was in various instances retained, as we may see in the early history of the Hebrew patriarchs:

I readily allow, that such conclusions are very justly drawn from such premises; and they are in fact the *only* premises, from which such conclusions *can* be drawn: for, though Hero-worship (as we shall presently see) may easily and naturally be traced as springing *directly* out of that patriarchal worship of the true God, which prevailed immediately after the deluge; it is impossible (as the bishop distinctly perceived) to reach Sabianism, if viewed as the EARLIEST form of postdiluvian idolatry, except *through the preparatory* MEDIUM *of barbarous and atheistic ignorance.* But are his lordship's premises

but, as wars and conquests took place in the world, it was more and more obliterated; until, at length, nearly all traces of it disappeared. Doubtless, in some cases, men may have *degenerated* into the savage state: and their subsequent emergence from such a state into social life may have been a process, not dissimilar to that described by the bishop. This seems to have been the fate of the old Pelasgic or Indo-Scythic Greeks; for their ancestors were the untamed nomades of the Caucasus: and it may also have been the fate of certain other nations, whose forefathers had been placed in the same circumstances. But it is surely an abuse of terms to call that *a state of* NATURE, what in fact is *a condition of* DEGENERACY *from man's* REAL *state of nature* namely *a state of regular society:* and it is surely a no less unwarrantable departure from authentic history to assume *an* UNIVERSAL *degeneracy into barbarism,* as the basis upon which to erect a theory of the origin of civil government. The *mutum et turpe pecus* may be tolerated in a heathen poet, who had no authentic records to correct his mistake: but the Bible gives a very different account of the matter.

themselves sound? I more than suspect, that they will not bear the test of examination: and, if so, it is easy to discern the fate of the conclusions deduced from them.

The premises are, that *the early descendants of Noah soon lost the revealed knowledge of their Creator*, and that *they shortly degenerated into the grossness of stupid barbarism.* Upon these ALLEGED FACTS is built the entire superstructure, that *Sabianism was the* MOST ANCIENT *form of postdiluvian idolatry.*

What proof then have we, that *the* EARLY *descendants of Noah* SOON *lost the revealed knowledge of their Creator?* Or rather what probability, or even possibility, is there, that such knowledge should be SPEEDILY obliterated among the EARLY descendants of the patriarch? Bishop Warburton seems to have felt the unlikelihood of this occurrence, while mankind were united in a single community: he therefore *first* disperses them, and *then* sinks them into the barbarism of savage life, by way of accounting for that *utter ignorance of the true God* which he perceived to be so necessary to his system.

But here again what evidence have we, either that mankind remained SOUND worshippers of God until *after* the dispersion (which we *must* assume to be the case, if Sabianism were the EARLIEST postdiluvian idolatry, and if Sabianism itself did not start up until *after* the disper-

sion); or that, when mankind *were* dispersed, they UNIVERSALLY degenerated into barbarism? The very building of the tower shews, that at all events there was much *daring impiety* before the dispersion: and, if we may in any degree credit the general voice of antiquity, the tower itself was the first pyramidal temple or high place reared in honour of the false gods of Paganism.

So likewise, with respect to the alleged barbarism, which is pronounced to be the mean, through which mankind universally passed into Sabianism: what proof have we, that any such degeneracy took place to the extent requisite for the theory? We have reason to believe, that the Host of Heaven was venerated in Babylonia. But this province was the nucleus of the great and *highly civilized* Iranian empire; which subsisted, to say nothing of the later Babylonic monarchy, full fifteen centuries[1]: this province was the native country of those ancestors of Abraham, himself only ten generations from Noah; who, PREVIOUS *even to the early age of Abraham,* are declared to have *served other gods*[2]. Hence, if Sabianism were the FIRST postdiluvian idolatry, it must have been in existence an indefinite time BEFORE *the birth of Abraham:* and consequently, on the

[1] See Origin of Pagan Idol. book vi. chap. 2.
[2] Joshua xxiv. 2.

hypothesis of the bishop, all mankind must have degenerated into gross atheistic barbarism during the period, which elapsed between the flood and the birth of that patriarch. Egypt also was notorious for its early idolatry; of which the worship of the heavenly bodies formed an essential part, since even in the days of Joseph (and, how much prior, we know not) we find there a regularly consecrated priest of On or the Sun: but it was equally celebrated for its *early civilization*, a civilization certainly more ancient than the time of Abraham. The same remark may be applied to India and China, though perhaps not with quite equal positiveness. Still however we may safely pronounce from the testimony of history, that, so far from mankind universally sinking into stupid barbarism when they were dispersed from Babel, several *highly civilized* empires rose up, either immediately after the dispersion as the Iranian, or very shortly after as the Egyptian and the Indian.

Nor is this all: granting, what is probable enough, that *some* of the dispersed tribes might soon become brutal savages; then, according to the theory of the bishop, we must pronounce, that Sabianism sprang up among *these savages* in consequence of their having *early lost the revealed knowledge of their Creator*, not in *the civilized empires* which *retained* that knowledge by reason of their never having degenerated into barbarism.

But how stands the fact? Why, just the opposite to what is required by the Warburtonian theory. So far as we can gather any thing from history relative to the origination of Sabianism, it appears to have sprung up in *polished* Chaldèa, not among the *ignorant* hordes of nomade savages. At any rate, since we find it at a very early period both in Babylonia and in Egypt, the inhabitants of those countries must, according to the present hypothesis, be supposed to have borrowed it from the savages with whom it originated; for the bishop evidently finds it impossible to reach the Sabian superstition, except by passing through the mean of barbarism: that is to say, polished nations must have consented to become the pupils of savages; a circumstance the very same, as if the English settlers of North-America should have relinquished the Christianity of their fathers to embrace the Paganism of the Chickasaws or the Cherokees.

Yet neither is this the only difficulty. According to Bishop Warburton, mankind passed from the worship of Jehovah to the worship of the Heavenly Host, *through the medium of gross* IGNORANCE *and savage* BARBARISM: but according to St. Paul, their progress was *through the directly opposite medium of a pretended* WISDOM. They did not apostatise *through ignorance*, and *because they had lost all knowledge of their Creator:* but they lapsed into error, *because they became*

vain in their imaginations, and *because they professed themselves to be wise*. In short, if we may believe the inspired apostle, it was *by* WISDOM, not *through* IGNORANCE, that *the world knew not God*[1].

Thus, in every point of view, is the theory of Bishop Warburton, which would exhibit Sabianism as the OLDEST modification of postdiluvian idolatry, utterly untenable. We have not the slightest grounds for believing, either that the early descendants of Noah soon lost the revealed knowledge of their Creator, or that after the dispersion they universally became rude barbarians, or that Sabianism sprang up *subsequent* to the dispersion. But, if we be thus precluded from conducting mankind into Sabianism *through the medium of the savage life*: in what other manner shall we account for the alleged fact; that, on the part of the sincere worshippers of God, idolatry COMMENCED with the adoration of that Heavenly Host, which from their youth they had been taught to consider as the mere handy-work of Jehovah? On what rational principles shall we determine the train of thought, by which such men could ever BEGIN to worship the Sun and the Moon and the Planets and the Stars[2].

[1] Rom. i. 21, 22. 1 Corinth. i. 21.

[2] The bishop pursues the same subject at large in his Div. Leg. book iii. sect. 6. § II: but he does it after a manner not at all more satisfactory.

(2.) Nor is the bishop more satisfactory in his account of the rise of Hero-worship.

1. It must never be forgotten, that the basis of his whole theory is *the assumption of a particular fact*. But this alleged fact neither has been, nor ever can be, proved.

Feeling it impossible to conduct mankind to Sabianism, when viewed as the MOST ANCIENT form of postdiluvian idolatry, *except through the medium of such gross previous barbarism as should have caused the total loss of the knowledge of the one true God;* he assumes this barbarism as a fact, and argues from it as if it were indisputable: when, all the while, not the least proof is brought of its actual occurrence. Yet this is the very matter, which, if possible, ought most carefully and most fully to have been demonstrated. To prove such a point, however, is impossible; and *that* for the very best reason: this imaginary barbarism, upon which rests the bishop's entire theory, never existed. *Some* wandering nomade tribes, after the dispersion, might indeed fall into it; but this is not sufficient for the theory before us: because it is built upon the postulate, that ALL men subsequent to the deluge lost through barbarism the knowledge of God; whence it is argued, that, to men *so circumstanced*, the worship of the heavenly bodies would be the most natural and therefore the first-adopted worship. Where then is the proof of *this* UNIVERSAL *lapse into ignorant barbarism?* Here, where the greatest copiousness was requisite, the learned prelate is silent.

As for the mere conjectures of the classical writers, both on this point and on the priority of Sabianism, what do they prove? Just nothing at all. Their records extended backward only to a comparatively small distance: and very possibly their own nomade ancestors of the Pelasgic stock may have degenerated into barbarism. But what then? Have we hence any satisfactory demonstration of the bishop's postulate?

This he supposes to have sprung up, when men were reclaimed from barbarism to social

In fact, the only authentic history of what occurred during the first ages after the deluge is contained in the Pentateuch: and here we find not a vestige of the alleged barbarism.

Did any such state occur between the deluge and the commencement of the Iranian Empire under Nimrod, who was but the third in descent from Noah? If it did, where is the proof? Yet there can be little doubt, that postdiluvian idolatry first sprang up under that prince, and that from the plain of Shinar it was carried to the utmost extremities of the earth. Accordingly, Babylon is described in Holy Writ, as being *the parent* of idolatry: and the *ancestors* of Abraham, *himself* only the tenth from Noah, are said to have served other gods *in the region of Chaldèa* long before that patriarch was born. Josh. xxiv. 2. But the chief god whom they worshipped, seems evidently to have been the solar fire, adored (I believe, on the authority of Herodotus and Strabo) in conjunction with the principal hero Belus, whose temple and reputed sepulchre was the tower itself: for the city *Ur*, whence Abraham came forth, plainly received its name from *Ur* which denotes *the solar fire*. Sabianism therefore must *then* have been in existence, whether it was prior or posterior to Demonolatry. Consequently, on the hypothesis of Bishop Warburton, it must have been *preceded* in Chaldèa by a barbarism so great, that all knowledge of the true God had been obliterated. Where is the scriptural proof, where is even the moderate probability, that any such barbarism had prevailed in Chaldèa previous to the time of Abraham?

With respect to the pagan writers, whom the bishop cites in favour of his opinion that Sabianism was *more ancient* than Demonolatry, I can build little upon their testimony when I consider their means of information; and still less, when I find it directly contradicted by that of other writers. The

life; Hero-worship being as much the natural offspring of the latter, as Sabianism was the

very remarkable evidence of Sanchoniatho, that the worship of dead men and women was the *earliest* postdiluvian idolatry, and that the mere straining alone of a subsequent age converted their personal histories into imaginary physical allegories, has already been noticed. To this I may add the no less remarkable testimony of Hesiod, that the Demon-gods of the Gentiles, so far from being the several legislators of each reclaimed tribe (as Bishop Warburton contends), were in truth that primeval race which flourished during the golden age at the commencement of the mundane system.

2. The sum therefore of the whole argument will be this.

It is impossible, as the bishop rightly judges, that man should ever have been led to embrace *naked Sabianism*, as the EARLIEST mode of postdiluvian idolatry, without first passing through such a state of barbarism as obliterated all knowledge of the true God. But we have proof, that the worship of *other gods*, and therefore *a fortiori* on the Warburtonian system the worship of the Celestial Host, existed *before* the birth of Abraham (Josh. xxiv. 2.): and we have at least negative proof from the total silence of Scripture, that no state of atheistic barbarism could have universally prevailed *between* that era and the deluge. Therefore man cannot have been conducted to Sabianism through the medium of barbarous ignorance. But there is no other medium, by which he *can* be conducted to it as the EARLIEST mode of postdiluvian idolatry: and this pretended medium has no existence. Therefore he cannot have been conducted to Sabianism, as the EARLIEST mode of postdiluvian idolatry: or, in other words, Sabianism cannot have PRECEDED Hero-worship.

In reality, the *naked* Sabianism of the bishop never existed at all. At no period since the deluge were the heavenly bo-

natural offspring of the former. Grateful for the benefits derived from civilization, men, if we

dies worshipped *simply*. They were venerated, as the imaginary abodes of the hero-gods: they were worshipped, BECAUSE the souls of the hero-gods were thought to occupy them.

3. The illustrious Sir Isaac Newton is censured by Bishop Warburton for contending, that Hero-worship was the earliest form of postdiluvian idolatry. Div. Leg. book iii. sect. 6. p. 268—271.

Sir Isaac however, I will venture to say, is perfectly in the right as to his chronological arrangement of the matter: and this I the rather say, because he wisely proceeds on the sound principle of *historical evidence*, not on the visionary principle of *a mere unsupported conjecture*. Newton was fully aware, that idolatry did NOT spring out of *a state of gross atheistic barbarism*, but out of *a state of regularly polished civilization when as yet the knowledge of the true God could not have been lost by the descendants of Noah*. Hence he justly concludes, that the earliest postdiluvian idolatry must have been the worship of deified men. His words are very remarkable, as forming a decided contrast to Warburton's theory of *a general lapse into gross barbarism* as THE MEAN through which the worship of the heavenly bodies was introduced.

Idolatry began in Chaldea and Egypt—for the countries upon the Tigris and the Nile, being exceeding fertile, were first frequented by mankind, and GREW FIRST INTO KINGDOMS, *and* THEREFORE *began first to adore their dead kings and queens.* Chronol. p. 160, 161.

Here, instead of unauthorized conjecture, we have solid history. Let the earliest postdiluvian idolatry have been what it may, it most assuredly did NOT spring out of a state of ignorant barbarism; a supposition absolutely necessary to the hypothesis of the PRIORITY of Sabianism,

may credit the learned prelate, too hastily deified those superior fellow-mortals who had civilized them: and, as the same process took place in every part of the globe, and as the workings of the human mind will ordinarily be the same under the same circumstances, each reclaimed tribe was equally led to deify its own proper benefactors.

Such is the mode, in which the bishop conducts his aspirants into the mysteries of Hero-worship.

Now, according to this theory, it is manifest, that TOTALLY DIFFERENT persons would be deified by different nations. Whence it would follow, that, although their several characters might agree in the single point of *their being legislators;* in all other points, they would vary just as much, as the individuals themselves would vary from each other: so that there should be no mutual resemblance between the hero-gods of any two nations, save in the single particular of *legislator* and *its inseparable adjuncts.*

Do we then find this to be the case? Quite the reverse. The VERY SAME hero-gods, with the VERY SAME attributes and with the VERY SAME remarkable history attached to them, have been venerated in every quarter of the globe. They so agree in short with each other, and that too IN MATTERS PURELY ARBITRARY, that it is impossible not to believe them ONE AND

THE SAME family of deified mortals. But, if the Gentiles universally worshipped the SAME hero-gods; those hero-gods cannot be their respective DIFFERENT legislators, who are supposed by Bishop Warburton to have *severally* reclaimed them from barbarism. On the contrary, as the hero-gods in question are alike venerated by ALL nations; they must be certain men, in whom ALL nations are interested, and with whom at some remote period ALL nations have been connected.

This however brings us back, for the rise of Hero-worship, to an era which *preceded* the dispersion: and, accordingly, the historical characters of the pagan gods clearly evince them to be chiefly the members of the Adamitic and Noëtic families. But, if hero-worship originated *before* the dispersion (and in no other manner can we satisfactorily account for the SAME heroes being venerated in EVERY part of the world); then it cannot have sprung up through the medium of an imaginary barbarism, which was the *consequence* of the dispersion, and which had produced Sabianism *previously* to Hero-worship. That is to say, men cannot have been led into Hero-worship through the medium of barbarism preceding a state of later civilization: but, having adopted it, by whatever process of the human mind, while united in a single body politic; they alike carried it with them, ready digested and excogitated, into the various re-

gions whither they retired upon their dispersion.

To this conclusion, which at once subverts the theory, that mankind were dispersed *previous* to the rise of idolatry, and that as many *different* heroes were venerated as there were different nations: to this conclusion we are inevitably brought by the circumstance of *the* PALPABLE IDENTITY *of the hero-gods*, wheresoever they might be worshipped.

(3.) The same mode of reasoning furnishes an additional argument against the bishop's hypothesis of the rise of Sabianism.

If the worship of the heavenly bodies sprang up INDEPENDENTLY among insulated tribes in a state of barbarism, on the broad principle; that, when savages had lost the knowledge of the true God, they would all, without any concert or communication, be naturally led to adore the visible Celestial Host rather than any other objects: if such were the rise of Sabianism, the heavenly bodies would either be universally adored SIMPLY as the heavenly bodies; or, if any ARBITRARY notions were superadded to their worship, those notions would be mutually quite DISSIMILAR as they prevailed among different unconnected tribes.

But this is not the case. The pagans did not adore the Sun and the Moon SIMPLY, but ARBITRARILY: and those identical ARBITRARY NOTIONS, which prevailed in one region, pre-

vailed also in another. Allowing for a moment that men universally degenerated into gross and stupid barbarism, we may easily conceive, that they might all, *without any concert*, be led to adore the Sun and the Moon: but we cannot so easily conceive, how they might all, still *without any concert*, be induced to believe, that the Sun once reigned a mortal upon earth, that he had sailed over the ocean in a ship, that he had been reduced to extreme danger by the violence of the sea, that he had been compelled to take refuge from it in a floating island, that the Moon was in some manner or other connected with a ship, that she had floated upon the surface of the waters, that she was the general receptacle of the eight great gods, and that she was rightly deemed the mother of the world. Notions like these are plainly ARBITRARY, and have no OBVIOUS or NATURAL connection with the Sun and the Moon: yet, more or less fully, we may trace them all the way from India to America. How then are we to account for their so frequent occurrence? I see no rational mode of solving the problem, except this: that Sabianism, wherever it prevailed, did not spring up in this nation or in that nation *without any mutual concert or intercourse;* but that it was first struck out with the ARBITRARY speculations annexed to it, when all mankind were united in one great community, and that, having been thus ARBITRARILY modelled, it was afterward car-

ried off by them to their various settlements when they were dispersed from the centrical region of Babylonia. Let this theory be adopted, which exactly accords with Scripture; and we shall find no difficulty in accounting for those ARBITRARY speculations, which characterize both Sabianism and Hero-worship in every part of the globe. But, if we *thus* account for so extraordinary a fact (and I see not, how we can satisfactorily account for it in any other manner); then the whole theory of Bishop Warburton must at once be relinquished as untenable: for we shall now be compelled to place the rise both of Sabianism and of Hero-worship *anterior* to the dispersion from Babel; instead of supposing mankind, *first* to be dispersed while uncorrupted worshippers of the true God, *then* by sinking into savage barbarism to lose all revealed knowledge of their Creator, *next* to be led through pure ignorance to the worship of the Heavenly Host and the Material Elements, *then* to be severally and unconnectedly reclaimed from barbarism to social life by various different men of superior intellectual attainments, *then* to worship their benefactors after death from motives of gratitude, and *then lastly* to have been seduced into bestial symbol-worship through the Machiavellian policy of their subsequent legislators.

The whole of this theory, which to its other manifold errors adds that glaring one of making Sabianism chronologically *precede* Hero-worship,

seems to me to be entirely unsupported by evidence and to be altogether irreconcileable with existing facts.

IV. Still we have to inquire, by what steps idolatry under *any* form could spring up after the flood among a race of men, who had been educated in the worship of the true God, and who had received even from eye-witnesses or from the sons of eye-witnesses an account of the tremendous destruction of a guilty world: for *the* UNIFORMITY *of Paganism in things* ARBITRARY, wherever it is or wherever it may have been the established religion, proves it of necessity to have originated, *previous* to the disruption of the first single society, and *previous* to the general dispersion of mankind.

Now it is clear, that bad example could not have been the cause of its origination: for the worship of the true God *alone* must have prevailed during the period, which immediately succeeded the deluge. The cause therefore can only be sought for in some very peculiar operation or process of the human mind, altogether abstracted from any pernicious example. But, as I have already argued at large, by no conceivable process of the mind can the early post-diluvians have been brought *direct* from the worship of the true God to the naked worship of the Heavenly Host. If Sabianism were the *first* idolatry after the flood, mankind must have passed to it, not *direct*, but *through the medium of*

previous atheistic barbarism. We find them Sabians however, before they *could* have passed through any such preparatory medium: and yet it is impossible for them to have been brought *direct* from the worship of God to the worship of the heavenly bodies. What then was the true medium, by which they actually reached Sabianism? I reply, on the authority of the Gentiles themselves; that the medium, through which they were brought to it, was not *atheistic barbarism* (as Bishop Warburton contends), but *the worship of deified heroes.* They venerated the Host of Heaven, BECAUSE the souls of the heroes were thought to have been translated after death to the Sun and the Moon and the Planets and the Stars. THEREFORE Hero-worship must needs have been PRIOR to Sabianism, even as the cause is PRIOR to the effect.

Hero-worship then was the EARLIEST form of postdiluvian idolatry. But Hero-worship was in existence, before mankind *could* have lost the knowledge of the true God by lapsing into atheistic barbarism. Therefore mankind must have passed to Hero-worship, BEFORE they had lost the knowledge of the one true God, through whatever medium they might have been conducted to it. Hence it is our present business to inquire, by what extraordinary process of the human mind they could, in the *first* in-

stance, have been seduced into this widely spreading delusion.

The conducting of such an inquiry, to which all that I have said relative to the idolatry of the Gentiles is to be viewed only in the light of a preface or introduction, will be found, if I mistake not, to afford a very striking proof, that that early race of men, who flourished during the patriarchal ages whether antediluvian or postdiluvian, were very well acquainted, both with the doctrine of *sacrificial redemption by a predicted future Deliverer*, and with the yet more recondite doctrine that *the predicted Deliverer should be an incarnate anthropomorphic manifestation of the Divinity himself.*

1. It was declared to our first parents immediately after the fall, that the Seed of the woman should bruise the head of the serpent, but that the serpent should bruise his heel.

With respect to *the precise import* of the phrase here employed *The Seed of the woman*, let us allow that it was *not* revealed to Adam and Eve, though in general terms they might have been taught *the nature* of the promised Deliverer. In that case, as such a phrase must obviously have excited no small curiosity and speculation, different opinions would soon arise as to its strict and proper import.

Since, in point of mere grammar, we are not absolutely bound to conclude, that *the Seed of*

the woman denotes *the* EXCLUSIVE *Seed of the woman:* two opinions would prevail from the very first, as to the MODE of the Deliverer's birth; though there would be but one opinion, as to his NATURE. The same *knowledge*, as that which produced the remarkable exclamation of Eve on the nativity of Cain, would lead all her posterity to agree; that, whenever the Deliverer *did* appear, he would be THE MAN even JEHOVAH HIS VERY SELF: but the same *uncertainty* as to the precise import of the phrase, which probably led to her hasty exclamation, would induce some to expect, that the GOD-MAN, so far as his corporeal part was concerned, would be born *both* of a mortal father and of a mortal mother; while others, influenced by the genealogical anomalousness of the phrase, would contend, that he would be born of a mortal mother *exclusively*.

A perversion of these opinions, long remembered and carefully handed down to posterity, was the medium, through which mankind were conducted to that earliest postdiluvian idolatry, the worship of the Hero-gods. Except so far as a perversion of such opinions served as a medium, the human race passed DIRECT to Hero-worship from the adoration of the one eternal Jehovah.

As the Word or Angel of the Lord was wont to manifest himself in a human form, and as it was foretold that at some indefinite period he

would be born in the same figure from the womb of a female: it is easy to perceive what speculations these matters would give rise to, according as he was expected to be born from a woman in the ordinary course of generation, or as he was expected to be born from a virgin after some ineffable and preternatural manner.

(1.) They, who held the former opinion, would be looking out for his manifestation in almost every child that came into the world: and, when at length a great deflection took place from the sincere patriarchal worship, which certainly happened at Babel *after* the deluge whatever might be the apostatic notions and practices of those who lived *before* that catastrophè; when this great deflection at length took place, Hero-worship commenced on the avowed theory, that, as the Divine Word had repeatedly exhibited himself in a human figure by numerous descents from heaven, so he had repeatedly been born an infant and had permanently dwelt among men for the purpose either of reformation or of vengeance or of regal government[1].

Pursuant to this theory, which claimed to be the very essence of sacred wisdom, it was contended, that the righteous Enoch, who had been

[1] For an account of the numerous descents of the anthropomorphic Word or Angel of Jehovah, see Horæ Mosaic. book ii. sect. i. chap. 2. See also Origin of Pagan Idol. book vi. chap. 6.

visibly rapt to heaven after the precise mode in which the anthropomorphic Word was accustomed to convey himself away, was no other than a manifestation of that Word, who then appeared in order that he might call men to repentance. The same character was afterward ascribed to Noah; who similarly sustained the office of a preacher of righteousness, and who was additionally manifested as the agent of destructive vengeance. When matters were thus far advanced, it would not be long, ere Adam and Abel and other eminent personages were considered under the same aspect. In short, every remarkable man, who had lived upon earth, would, on similar principles, be fondly deemed an incarnation of the Word or an appearance of the promised Son of the woman; agreeably to the mistaken impression of Eve herself, relative to the character of her first-born Cain: and, at the same time, the various descents of that august Being, which took place like his first descent in Paradise *without* the intervention of a human birth, would be carefully noted and long traditionally remembered.

Under such circumstances, and while such speculations were afloat, it is obvious, that a wide door would be opened to sacerdotal or political imposture. An artful adventurer might strengthen his rising domination, or an unprincipled priest might vindicate to himself super-

eminent honours, on the avowed plea, that they were severally the predicted Son of the woman, now as at other times born incarnate into the world. This, accordingly, seems to have actually taken place at Babel, when the wily offspring of Cush established an universal empire over his brethren. Whatever his real name may have been, he appears to have emphatically denominated himself *Nin* or *the Son*[1]; an appellation, which he communicated to his new capital when miraculously compelled to evacuate Babel[2]: for *Nineveh* is a compound word, which denotes *the Son's habitation*. This sacrilegious offence worthily appeared so heinous in the eyes of God, that the inspired historian was instructed to hand him down to posterity by a name, indignantly formed of the title which he had assumed by uniting it with a word which signifies *to rebel* or *to apostatise*. Hence the appellation *Nimrod* is equivalent to *the rebel against the Son*; being a compound strictly analogous to, and formed on the very same principles, as the familiar apostolical word *Antichrist*[3]. The example of this daring traitor was followed by more than one of his successors in empire: and the founders of the second and third Assy-

[1] The *Ninus* of the Greek historians.

[2] See Origin of Pagan Idol. book vi. chap. 2. § I.

[3] *Nimrod* I take to be formed by crasis from *Nim-Marad*. I need scarcely remark, that *Marad* is universally acknowledged to be the second radical of this compound title.

rian dynasties affected each to denominate himself, in imitation of the original founder of the monarchy, *Nin* or *Ninus* or *the Son*[1]. Such a practice widely spread itself in the East: and it may be distinctly traced likewise in the West. To this day, the principal god of China, Thibet, Siam, and other large Asiatic districts, is devoutly believed to be successively born incarnate as an infant in the person of the Dalai-Lama: and the late emperor of the first of those countries, whether from enthusiasm or policy or a mixture of both, had brought himself to imagine or at least affected to imagine, what soon became at court an article of faith, that his favourite deity had vouchsafed to become incarnate in his person[2]. A similar notion pre-

[1] The doctrine of *an incarnate anthropomorphic Divinity*, under the express title of *the Son of God*, prevailed in the Babylonic empire down even to the time of Nebuchadnezzar. See Dan. ii. 25. I have little doubt, that *the watcher* and *the holy one*, whom that prince beheld in his vision, was considered by him as this identical mysterious personage: and he styled him *a watcher* under the impression of much the same idea, as the Phenicians and the Canaanites denominated the Stars, supposed to be instinct with the presiding souls of the Hero-gods, *watchers* or *speculators*. Sanchon. apud Euseb. Præp. Evan. lib. i. c. 10. Numb. xxiii. 14. The *Zophim*, to whom the top of the high-place Pisgah was dedicated, were doubtless, I think, the *Zophe-Samen* of the Phenician mythologist. In a similar manner, the human hand, seen by Belshazzar, would be ascribed by him to that anthropomorphic Being, whom Nebuchadnezzar styled *the Son of God*. Dan. v. 5.

[2] Staunton's Embassy to China. vol. iii. p. 68.

vailed throughout Egypt, save only that the symbolical bull was substituted for the literal man: and, as Buddha is still held to be successively born in each infant Lama, so the god Osiris was equally thought to be successively born in each consecrated Mneuis[1]. Nor was the doctrine of a human incarnation by any means altogether lost in that country. Diodorus gives a curious account of an infant, in whose person Osiris was thought to have been born into the world in order that he might thus exhibit himself to mortals: and what Herodotus says of the Egyptian Perseus, who was the same divinity with Osiris, requires us of necessity to suppose, that at certain intervals a man was brought forward by the priests as an incarnation of their god[2]. The claim of the great Alexander to be the son of Ammon, the flattery which held forth Antony and Cleopatra as new manifestations of Osiris and Isis, and the worship paid to the living Roman emperors even before their imagined apotheosis, are equally variations of the same ancient superstition[3].

[1] Plut. de Isid. § 20. Diod. Bibl. lib. i. p. 76.

[2] Diod. Bibl. lib. i. p. 20. Herod. Histor. lib. ii. 91.

[3] This superstition, after the very form in which I supposed it to have originated, was revived in the eighth century, according to D'Herbelot, by an impostor well acquainted both with Judaism and Mohammedism and Paganism. His doctrine was, that God successively manifested himself in the persons of various eminent prophets and other celebrated

As these notions may all be traced to the long-remembered prophecy, that in due time the Word of Jehovah should be born of woman: so the various legends, in whatsoever mythology, which exhibit a god as descending upon earth in a human figure, may all be equally traced to a vivid tradition, that the Divine Voice was accustomed in old times thus occasionally and briefly to reveal himself to mortals[1]. Hence

men, until at length he became incarnate in this new minister of heaven. *Sa doctrine étoit, que Dieu avoit pris une forme et figure humaine depuis qu' il eut commandé aux anges d' adorer Adam, le premier des hommes. Qu' après la mort d' Adam, Dieu étoit apparu sous la figure de plusieurs prophetes et autres grands hommes qu' il avoit choisis jusqu' à ce qu' il prit celle d' Abu Moslem prince de Khorassan, lequel professoit l' erreur de la Tenassukhiah ou Metempsychose; et qu', après la mort de ce prince, la Divinité étoit passée et descendre en sa personne.*

[1] The existence and substance of such a tradition is set forth in a very remarkable manner by Themistius. Αλλ' εοικε και ὁ παλαιος λογος αληθης ειναι λιαν και της αρχαιας φιλοσοφιας, ὥς αρα, κατα χρονους τινας ὡρισμενους, ἀκηρατοι εκ θειαι δυναμεις επ' αγαθῳ των ανθρωπων εμβατευουσι την γην, εκ του ουρανου κατιουσαι, ουκ ηερα ἐσσαμενοι, καθ' Ἡσιοδον, αλλα σωματα αμφιεσαμεναι παραπλησια τοις ἡμετεροις, και βιον ὑποδυσαι ἡττω της φυσεως, ἑνεκεν της προς ἡμας κοινωνιας. Themist. Orat. vii. p. 90. *But the ancient account seems to be very true and of the primeval philosophy, that, at certain fixed times, pure and divine powers, for the good of men, walk upon the earth, descending from heaven; not clothed in air, as Hesiod speaks, but having assumed bodies similar to our own, and having taken upon themselves a life inferior to their nature, for the sake of fellowship with us.* Themistius refers to the passage of Hesiod, wherein he

originated the numerous Avatars of Hindostan: in which a god, who is depicted treading upon the head of a serpent while the serpent is in the act of biting his heel, successively descends in a human form or occasionally in a semi-human form, for the purpose either of mercy or justice: and hence originated the well-known classical tales, of Jupiter conversing in the figure of a man with the impious Lycaon immediately before the deluge, and of the same god with Mercury as his companion rewarding under a similar form the piety of Baucis and Philemon while he plunges the inhabitants of an irreligious city beneath the waters of an ample lake[1]. The doctrine was still vivid at the first preaching of the Gospel: for, when Paul miraculously healed an impotent man at Lystra, he and Barnabas were forthwith supposed to be anthropomorphic descents of Mercury and Jupiter[2].

(2.) They, who held the latter opinion, were not inclined to differ *very* widely from those, who advocated the former.

describes those illustrious men of the golden age; who, after their death, *clad in air* and flitting about in every direction upon earth, became the guardians of mortals. Oper. et Dier. lib. i. ver. 108—125.

[1] In the Mysteries, a lake was the symbol of the diluvian ocean: whence originated the universal sacredness of lakes and small islands. See Origin of Pagan Idol. book ii. chap. 2. book iii. chap. 6. book v. chap. 7. § I. 3.

[2] Acts xiv. 8—13.

A literal instance indeed of a virgin-born personage, who might claim to be an incarnation of the Word, they were of course unable to produce: but allegory or fiction readily supplied the place of strict reality. Since they interpreted the promise to Eve as denoting that the Word should be born incarnate of a virgin-mother, and since they were fully aware that there had been more than one descent of the Godhead in a human form[1]: they analogically contended, that he was to be born of a virgin, not once only, but often: whence they maintained, that he had *already* been thus born into the world though at an era prior to that in which they themselves flourished, and that at some future period he would again after a similar manner preternaturally make his appearance. Coinciding however to a certain extent with those who held the other opinion, and allowing that various eminent deceased characters had been permanent incarnations of the Deity; they industriously sought to exhibit these characters, after a manner according with their own interpretation of the prophecy, as being severally produced from a virgin-mother. Such therefore they pronounced Adam to be; because he had no mortal father, but was born from the virgin womb of his great mother the

[1] See Horæ Mosaic. book ii. sect. i. chap. 2.

Earth[1]; and such they similarly declared Noah to be, who, viewed as another incarnation of the Word, was thence esteemed a mere transmigratory reappearance of Adam; because, without the coöperation of any human father, he was born into a new world from the virgin womb of his great mother the Ark. Thus, without denying the Word's *future* birth from a virgin, but rather strenuously maintaining it agreeably to their favourite dogma of a succession of similar worlds; they contended, that their principal divinity, in whom (as might indeed be expected from the mode in which Hero-worship originated) were strangely though systematically blended the characters of Adam and Enoch and Noah and the predicted Son of the woman, had been born without any mortal father from the womb of a pure virgin.

Of this peculiar superstition it is easy to produce various instances in countries widely separated from each other; a circumstance, which proves both its remote antiquity and its origination in each case from one and the same common source. A virgin-birth is alike ascribed to the oriental Buddha, to the Chinese Fo-Hi, to the Egyptian Phtha, to the Azteck

[1] This speculation is mentioned by Julius Firmicus. *De* VIRGINIS TERRÆ *limo homo factus est: nondum enim, ut ait Scriptura, supra terram pluerat.* Jul. Firm. de error. prof. rel. p. 51.

Mexitli, and to the classical Mars and Perseus: and in the East so deeply had the tenet of a *repeated* virgin-birth of the deity taken root, that, in a comparatively modern period, the Tartar Zingis, aware of the doctrine which had long prevailed among his countrymen, craftily built upon the old popular belief, and gave out that he was born of a virgin. His followers, to whom the pretended successive births of their divinity in the persons of the various Asiatic Lamas were perfectly familiar, readily acknowledged that miraculous conception of his mother, which raised him above the level of human nature: and the naked prophet, who in the name of the Deity invested their adventurous prince with the empire of the world, pointed the valour of the Moguls with irresistible enthusiasm[1].

The present opinion was often held in a somewhat modified shape. Instead of saying that their incarnate divinity was absolutely born from a virgin, the pagans very frequently

[1] Ratramn. de nat. Christi. c. 8. Asiat. Res. vol. ii. p. 375, 376, 383—386. vol. x. p. 27, 97. Martin Hist. Sinen. lib. i. p. 21. Apollod. Bibl. lib. i. c. 3. § 5. Hyg. Fab. in Præf. p. 9. Porphyr. apud Euseb. Præp. Evan. lib. ii. c. 11. Hesiod. Theog. ver. 927—929. Claviger. Torquemad. lib. vi. c. 1. Ovid. Fast. lib. v. ver. 231—258. Justin. Martyr. Dial. cum Tryph. p. 297. Gibbon's Hist. of the Decline. vol. vi. p. 42. See Origin of Pagan Idol. book iv. chap. 5. § XXVI.

taught, that he was born indeed from a mortal mother without the coöperation of any mortal father, but that his sire was one of the celestial deities: and yet, if we inquire more closely into their theology as it was universally expounded by their most learned doctors, we shall find, that the heavenly sire and his woman-born son are at length declared to be one and the same god manifesting himself under somewhat different aspects[1]. I need scarcely refer to the familiar tales of classical antiquity for multiplied examples of such a speculation. This notion is so nearly allied to the other, that we may often observe the same incarnate god variously pronounced to have been born of a virgin and to have been born of a mortal mother without any mortal father, his earthly parent in that case becoming pregnant by the mysterious obumbration of a celestial divinity[2].

Such were the doctrines of the Gentiles, with respect to the nature and the repeated anthropomorphic manifestations of their principal deity. Now, when these are viewed conjointly

[1] See Origin of Pagan Idol. book iv. chap. 1.

[2] The opinion in question was, among the pagans, often made subservient to the most infamous debauchery: but this very circumstance, occurring as it did from Babylon to Rome and from the time of Herodotus down to the low age of Tiberius Cæsar, establishes most decidedly the wide and long-lived prevalence of the tenet. See Herod. Hist. lib. i. c. 181. and Joseph. Ant. Jud. lib. xviii. c. 3.

with the exclamation of Eve, *I have gotten* THE MAN *even* JEHOVAH HIS VERY SELF, it is difficult to conceive, how either the doctrines or the exclamation could have originated, unless from some divine exposition of the first delivered oracle, which taught that the promised Seed of the woman should be that very MAN-JEHOVAH, who then appeared as the authoritative controuler of the serpent, and who then instituted the rite of sacrifice [1].

[1] That the doctrine of a virgin-born god originated from a vivid remembrance of the first prophecy, however it might be curiously blended with the birth of Adam from the virgin Earth and of Noah from the virgin Ark, is to this day positively declared by his eastern worshippers. The subject is so extraordinary, that I shall give my authorities at large.

The followers of Buddha unanimously declare, that his incarnation in the womb of a virgin was foretold several thousand years, though some say, one thousand only, before it came to pass. Asiat. Res. vol. x. p. 27.

Divines in India declare, that the surest proof of the divine mission of an Avatar is his coming being foretold: that prophecies concerning a Saviour are often repeated, some very plain, and others rather obscure: that they are, in short, one of the fundamental supports of their religion. Ibid. p. 37.

It is declared in the Vicrama-Charitra, that the birth of a divine child from a virgin had been foretold one thousand years before it happened, nay some say two thousand. The time of his birth is thus ascertained from the Cumarica-Chanda, a portion of the Scanda-Purana. When three thousand and one hundred years of the Cali-Yuga are elapsed; then Saca will appear, and remove wretchedness and misery from the world. Ibid. p. 46, 47. *Saca* is a title of the virgin-born Buddha.

Thus easily and naturally sprang up the post-diluvian Hero-worship of the Gentiles from what I take to have been a fundamental doctrine of Patriarchism; when, by artful and ambitious men, that doctrine was impiously perverted to subserve their own purposes. Mankind were not so idiotical, as gratuitously to forsake the worship of Jehovah, and in his place to adore their defunct ancestors simply because they *were* their ancestors: but they were taught to believe, that, in venerating certain eminent and remarkable characters, they in reality worshipped the successive incarnate manifestations of that Divine Word who was acknowledged on all hands to be Jehovah himself [1].

2. Such were the extraordinary notions, which the Gentiles entertained respecting the nature of their chief deity: nor were their sentiments less remarkable in regard to the atone-

[1] Traces of this opinion, which was the true source whence Hero-worship originated, occur with singular distinctness in the theology of Hindostan. *Whenever the deity condescends to be born of woman, the person is one, but there are two natures. To this distinction we must carefully attend, in order to reconcile many seeming contradictions in the Puranas; and more particularly so with respect to Vaivaswata and Satyavrata, who are acknowledged to be but one person. The divine nature is an emanation of Vishnou in his character of the Sun; and Satyavrata is the human nature. These two natures often act independently of each other, and may exist at the same time in different places.* Asiat. Res. vol. vi. p. 479.

ment by sacrifice, which their serpenticidal and virgin-born god was to make for them.

(1.) We are told by Eusebius from Sanchoniatho, that the god Il, who is said to have once reigned a mortal in Phenicia, when his country was endangered by a perilous war, dressed his only son in the emblems of royalty, and offered him up as a piacular victim on an altar specially prepared for that purpose. Now this is exhibited as an instance of what is declared to have been an established custom among the ancients; namely, that, in any calamitous emergency, the rulers of the state were wont to devote, in prevention of the general ruin, the best beloved of their children, as a ransom paid to the avenging demons: and we are further informed, that they, who were thus devoted, were devoted MYSTICALLY[1].

The expression is remarkable: and I have adduced the incident, chiefly *on account* of the expression. So far as I am able to comprehend its import, it can only mean, that the persons, who were in this manner sacrificed to avert the wrath of heaven from their guilty countrymen, MYSTICALLY represented some one; who was similarly, though eminently, destined to be a piacular sacrifice for the benefit of mankind in general.

[1] Euseb. Præp. Evan. lib. i. c. 10. lib. iv. c. 16. Nothing can be more explicit than the original Greek. *Κατεσφαττοντο δε οι διδομενοι* ΜΥΣΤΙΚΩΣ.

It is important to observe, that *the expression itself* is used, not specially of the Phenicians among whom *the incident* is said to have taken place, but of the ancients at large. Hence it will follow, that, although the Punic story of Il may very probably have some connection with the history of Abraham[1]; yet, both the practice of human sacrifices, and the peculiar notion attached to them, must have originated from a much more ancient source than the interrupted oblation of Isaac. The account indeed, which the neighbouring Phenicians and Canaanites would most probably soon receive of that affair, might *confirm* them in their belief that the sacrificial devotement of a piacular human victim was a MYSTICAL act; but it was plainly, I think, not *the primitive cause* of the belief itself: for, had that been the case, *the doctrine* would have been confined to Palestine; whereas *the doctrine itself*, no less than *the practice* (if we may credit the authorities of Eusebius), prevailed generally among the old idolaters.

(2.) But, that we *may* credit those authorities, I collect from the ancient theology of Hindostan: which at once sets forth, *how* such sacrifices were MYSTICAL; and proves indisputably, that the belief of their *being* MYSTICAL did not *originate* from the devotement of Isaac, though it would obviously be *confirmed* by that

[1] See Horæ Mosaic. book i. sect i. chap. 5. § V.

transaction. So far from the remote Hindoos having been able to *borrow* any speculation from the history of Abraham; the Phenicians themselves, who were a colony of Indo-Scythians from the sources of the Ganges and the Indus, must have brought with them into their new settlements the *already established* doctrine of their forefathers[1].

Now, among the Hindoos from time immemorial, the devoted victim, especially if he be a man, is considered as identified with the god to whom he is offered: and, as such, previous to his immolation, he is solemnly adored by the sacrificer. This adoration moreover, thus paid to him, is expressly pronounced to be of a MYSTERIOUS or MYSTICAL nature[2].

[1] See Origin of Pagan Idol. book vi. chap. 5. § V. 2.

[2] I give my authority at large. *Causing the victim to face the north, let the sacrificer worship the several deities presiding over the different parts of the victim's body: let the worship be then paid* TO THE VICTIM HIMSELF *by his name. O best of men! O most auspicious! O thou* WHO ART AN ASSEMBLAGE OF ALL THE DEITIES *and most exquisite! Bestow thy protection upon me: and part with thy organs of life, doing an act of benevolence!* THUS LET THE SACRIFICER WORSHIP THE VICTIM. *When this has been done, O my children,* THE VICTIM IS EVEN AS MYSELF; *and the guardian deities of the ten quarters take place in him. Then* BRAHMA AND ALL THE OTHER DEITIES ASSEMBLE IN THE VICTIM: *and be he ever so great a sinner, he becomes pure from his sin, and his blood changes to ambrosia. On occasions of sacrifices to other deities also,* BOTH THE DEITIES AND THE VICTIMS MUST BE WORSHIPPED, *previous*

Here then, no doubt, we have *the* MYSTICAL *doctrine*, which Eusebius declares to have been by the ancients generally associated with the practice of human sacrifices: and, from the circumstance of the victim being thus MYSTICALLY identified with the god to whom he is offered, nothing can be more clear, than that the MYSTERY consisted in esteeming the victim the representative or type of the god. But, if the victim was deemed the representative of the god, then the god himself must have been deemed a victim: otherwise there would have been no mutual resemblance, on which the MYSTIC doctrine could have been founded. Such, accordingly, we find to be actually the case.

The chief deity of the Hindoos, who is declared to be the same being as that extraordinary personage who is born of a virgin and who is depicted trampling on the head of a serpent while the serpent bites his heel, is said to have once embodied himself in the figure of a man. While thus incarnate, he produced, first an hermaphroditic being, and then from that hermaphroditic being (by dividing him in two) the

to the immolation. HAVING FIRST WORSHIPPED THE VICTIM, *whether man, beast, or bird, as directed, let the sacrificer immolate him, and address the deity with the text laid down before. Let the sacrificer say,* MYSTERIOUS PRAISE TO THIS VICTIM. Asiat. Res. vol. v. p. 379, 380, 381, 382, 386.

primeval man and woman who were the common ancestors of all other men and women. After this act of creation at the beginning of the world, the gods and the demigods and the holy sages, we are told, immolated him as a victim, and while immolating worshipped him [1].

[1] I shall here again give my authority at large. *The embodied spirit rose above this world. From him sprang Viraj; from whom the first man was produced: and he, being successively reproduced, peopled the earth. From that single portion, surnamed* The universal sacrifice, *was the holy oblation of butter and curds produced. From that universal sacrifice were produced the strains of the Rich and Samen. From* HIM *were produced horses, and cows, and goats, and sheep. Him, the gods, the demi-gods, named* Sadhya: *and the holy sages* IMMOLATED HIM AS A VICTIM *on sacred grass, and thus* PERFORMED A SOLEMN ACT OF RELIGION. *Into how many portions did they divide this being, whom they immolated? What did his mouth become? What are his arms, his thighs, and his feet, now called? His mouth became a priest: his arm was made a soldier: his thigh was transformed into a husbandman: from his feet sprang the servile man. The moon was produced from his mind: the sun sprang from his eye: air and breath proceeded from his ear: and fire rose from his mouth. The subtle element was produced from his navel; the sky, from his head; the earth, from his feet; and space, from his ear. Thus* DID HE FRAME WORLDS. *In that solemn* SACRIFICE, WHICH THE GODS PERFORMED WITH HIM AS A VICTIM, *spring was the butter; summer, the fuel; and sultry weather, the agent of oblation. Seven were the moats surrounding the altar: thrice seven were the logs of holy fuel:* AT THAT SACRIFICE WHICH THE GODS PERFORMED, IMMOLATING THIS BEING AS THE VICTIM. *By that sacrifice the gods* WORSHIPPED THIS VICTIM.

I need scarcely remark, that we have here a perverted account of the creation of the first pair by the incarnate Word of Jehovah, and that the Word himself is described as having been *literally* devoted at the original institution of piacular sacrifice when in reality nought save a *typical* victim was then offered up: I have chiefly adduced the tradition by way of demonstrating, that the imagined primeval oblation of the anthropomorphic god is the prototype and reputed origin of all other piacular oblations. For, just as the inferior gods and the demigods and the holy sages worship and then immolate the incarnate anthropomorphic divinity: so the officiating priests and sacrificers worship and then immolate the victim; who is declared to

Such were PRIMEVAL DUTIES: *and* THUS DID THEY ATTAIN HEAVEN, *where former gods and mighty demigods abide.* Hindoo Ritual apud Asiat. Res. vol. vii. p. 251, 252. Viraj, whom the sacrificed creator of the world is said to have formed in the first instance, was reputed to be an hermaphrodite. By his *falling in twain*, as the Brahmins speak, were produced the first man and woman, Menu the son of the Self-Existent and his consort Satarupa, or (as they are sometimes denominated) Adima and Iva. Yet was the chief divinity himself, that identical divinity who became a sacrifice, supposed to be incarnate in the person of this Menu or Adima: that is to say, in the phraseology of Hindostan, the first man was an *avatar* or anthropomorphic descent of the creator of the universe. Asiatic. Res. vol. viii. p. 441. vol. vi. p. 472, 473. vol. v. p. 247, 248. See, on this curious subject, Origin of Pagan Idol. book v. chap. 4.

represent that divinity, and whose praise is in consequence said to be MYSTERIOUS.

(3.) A similar notion appears to have prevailed among the ancient Chinese: for their great father and chief god, whom they believe to have been born from a virgin, is styled by them *the victim* or *the oblation.* Hence, I suppose, we must needs conclude, that they believe him, either to have been already sacrificed like the Hindoo divinity, or to be destined for a sacrifice during the period of some future transmigratory manifestation[1].

(4.) We may observe certain vestiges likewise of the same doctrine among the Greeks. Hercules, who is depicted on the sphere trampling the head of the serpent beneath his foot, was fabled to have been once bound as a victim, in order that he might be sacrificed to Jupiter. He refused indeed to submit; and, agreeably to the fancied prowess of his classical character, he routed and slew those who were about to devote him: but still, so faithfully in its grand outline was preserved the primitive tradition, this hero, who while an infant strangled with

[1] Asiat. Res. vol. ii. p. 375. Le Compte's China. p. 310. Le Compte was so struck with the singularity of the title as to observe upon it, that *it was a name, which the greatest saints of the Old or New Testament would have been proud to have, and which was reserved for him alone who made himself an oblation both for saints and sinners.*

scarce an effort the vipers which sought to destroy him in his cradle, died at length a sacrifice on the high-place of the Oetèan Jupiter, wrapped in a garment which derived its poison from the blood of the primeval or Paradisiacal centaur[1].

(5.) Nor was the tenet unknown among the Mexicans; having doubtless, with the great body of the national superstition, been brought by their forefathers out of Asia. The Spanish historians inform us, that they had a strange kind of idol, which was not an image, but a true man. For, when they took a captive, before they sacrificed him, they decorated him with the name of the idol to which he was destined to be offered: and, in order to make the resemblance as complete as possible, they decked him with the very same ornaments, as those worn by the divinity. During the time that this mummery continued, they worshipped him precisely as they did the god whom he represented: but, when the feast-day arrived,

[1] Herod. Hist. lib. ii. c. 45. Sophoc. Trachin. ver. 1207—1218. The scholiast, from the circumstance of Hercules being burned on a pile of wood upon the top of mount Oeta, seems to have had some notion, that he ought to be considered in the light of a sacrifice to his father Jupiter. Ὑψηλον ορος της Οιτης· παν τε ορος τε Διος ονομαζεται· επει (φασιν) ὑψιστῳ οντι τῳ θεῳ, εν ὑψει δει τας θυσιας ποιεισθαι τας προς αυτον. Schol. in loc.

the victim-deity, who had for months been an object of religious veneration, was solemnly devoted in sacrifice[1].

(6.) It is sufficiently evident, that the horrid practice of immolating *human* victims, as contradistinguished from *bestial* victims, must have originated from the same source as the extraordinary speculations which we have been considering. Well aware, that legitimate bestial victims were, in the primitive institution of sacrifice, made the representatives of the Man-Jehovah, who in fulness of time was to be born of a woman, and whose mortal part was to be bruised by the tooth of the serpent: well aware of this, as we may clearly collect from the recently adduced Indian tradition relative to the sacrifice of the chief hero-god; the early idolaters presumptuously sought to improve upon the ordinance, by using, as a victim, one, who would be a more perfect image of the incarnate anthropomorphic Divinity than any animal could possibly be. To produce instances of this well-known and once almost universal abomination would be superfluous: I am at present only concerned with *the train of thought*, which gave it birth.

3. Now in what manner shall we account for the very ancient prevalence of opinions, which, when analysed, are found exactly to agree

[1] Purchas. Pilgr. book viii. chap. 11. p. 796, 797.

with what we are taught in the Christian revelation?

The old pagans believed, that a mighty god repeatedly became incarnate in the human form; that, under that form, he openly conversed with mortals; that he thus exhibited himself in the day of the creation; that he was born under that shape, sometimes from a virgin, and sometimes from a woman; that he was properly depicted, as a man treading with his heel upon the head of a remordent snake; and that, although rightly worshipped as a deity, he had yet been put to death, having been solemnly offered up as a piacular sacrifice.

They likewise believed; that this same god had become incarnate, both in the person of the first-created man, and in the person also of another man who flourished during the prevalence of an universal deluge. Hence, while they carefully distinguished between his divine and human natures, and while they ascribed to him all the remarkable characteristics which have just been enumerated: they further attributed to him those identical actions and circumstances, which Holy Scripture attributes to Adam and Noah.

Such is the naked fact: and the question is, how we are to account for it. That the chief hero-god of the Gentiles should minutely answer to the recorded characters of Adam and Noah, were small wonder: for Hesiod has expressly told us, that the demon-gods were the

souls of those men who flourished during the first age of the world[1]. But, that this same chief hero-god should additionally answer, with no less minuteness to the predicted character of the Messiah, is a matter which cannot quite so easily be accounted for on any ordinary principles of the rise of Hero-worship. Let us however adopt the theory, that eminent men came to be adored because they were deemed incarnations or *avatars* of the Divine Word; and every difficulty will be removed. Hero-worship will, in that case, spring up easily and naturally out of perverted Patriarchism: and, when once it *has* sprung up, it will soon produce Sabianism on the grounds, which the pagans themselves have very definitely set forth; for, if the souls of the heroes were thought to pass after death into the heavenly bodies, then those bodies would obviously be revered as the vehicles or mansions of the canonized heroes.

But, if Hero-worship thus originated from perverted Patriarchism, we shall immediately perceive, how the speculations of the Gentiles may be employed to demonstrate, that, both the nature of the promised Deliverer, and the mode in which he would effect our deliverance, must have been well and familiarly known under the ancient Patriarchal Dispensation. The old patriarchs could not hand down to posterity,

[1] Hesiod. Oper. et Dier. lib. i. ver. 120—125.

what they themselves did not possess. But, if the speculations of the Gentiles relative to the sacrifice of their virgin-born god originated from patriarchal tradition, then the patriarchs must have been acquainted with them. If however the patriarchs were acquainted with such speculations, they must have had them immediately from the Deity: for it is difficult to conceive, how these tenets could otherwise have originated in the pure primeval Church; it is difficult to imagine, that the fathers, without any explanatory revelation, should in all points have hit upon the very interpretation of the first prophecy, which the Gospel has authoritatively declared to be the true one. Let us then now compare this conclusion, both with the primitive institution of sacrifice, which must have taken place immediately after the fall, because otherwise the raiment of our first parents could not have been fashioned out of the skins of slaughtered animals[1]; and also with the remarkable language employed by Eve on the birth of the primal man-child, *I have gotten* THE MAN *even* JEHOVAH HIS VERY SELF: and we shall be in a manner compelled to believe, that the doctrine of *atonement through the voluntary piacular sacrifice of the virgin-born Man-Jehovah* was very far from being unknown even to the earliest members of the ancient Patriarchal Church.

[1] Gen. iii. 21.

V. As an excellent practical illustration of the foregoing remarks, I shall conclude this discussion with exhibiting at full length one of the most extraordinary characters in the whole circle of pagan antiquity.

The extensive range of the Caucasus, that *stony girdle of the earth* as it is poetically denominated by the oriental writers, comprehends, at its eastern extremity, the Indian Coosh or Chusa-Ghar or Coh-Coosh; and, at its western extremity, the district of Ararat or Armenia [1]. But Ararat, the mount of the ship, coincides geographically with the garden of Paradise and the holy mount of God [2]. Caucasus therefore, as comprehending Ararat, is the pristine habitation of Adam, the region where the Divine Messenger appeared in a human form to our first parents and promised that the Seed of the woman should bruise the head of the remordent serpent, the country where Noah landed after navigating a shoreless ocean in the first-built ship. Caucasus however is at the same time the peculiar settlement of the pastoral Scythians: those unmingled descendants of the military Babylonic Cuthim; who, at remote periods, quitting their mountain seats, have subjugated Palestine and Egypt, and have intrusively planted Greece [3]. These

[1] Origin of Pagan Idol. book vi. chap. 4. § I.

[2] Ibid. book ii. chap. 1.

[3] Ibid. book vi. chap. 4, 5.

various characteristics of Caucasus and its inhabitants will serve to develop the very remarkable story of Prometheus: while, in return, that story will serve to throw a strong light on the preceding hypothesis relative to the origination of Avatarism and Hero-worship.

1. According to the Egyptians, Prometheus was one of their most ancient kings: and he lived at a period, when the greatest part of mankind was destroyed by a flood[1]. Yet he is likewise placed in Scythia: and he is said to have been the father of that Deucalion; who (as we learn from Lucian) was himself also a Scythian, who is equally claimed nevertheless by the Greeks and by the Hindoos and by the Syrians of Hierapolis, and who with his family was preserved in an ark at the time of the universal deluge[2]. He was the builder of the first ship: he was the great primeval physician: he was the original agriculturist and astronomer: and, to sum up the whole in a single word (as Eschylus speaks), all arts were derived to mortals from Prometheus[3].

Sometimes he was said to be the offspring of Uranus by the sea-nymph Clymenè[4]: sometimes

[1] Diod. Bibl. lib. i. p. 16.

[2] Apollod. Bibl. lib. i. c. 7. § 1, 2. Æschyl. Prom. Vinct. Luc. de dea Syra.

[3] Prom. Vinct. ver. 467, 468, 476—483, 462, 463, 457, 458, 505, 506.

[4] Schol. in Arat. Phænom. p. 34, 35.

he was reported to be the son of Japetus[1]: and sometimes he had Themis assigned to him as a mother, without any mention of a father[2]. Themis herself is identified with the universal mother Earth[3]: and she is variously said, to be the parent also of the virgin Astrea who flew away to heaven immediately before the deluge, and to be the same person as the virgin Astrea herself[4]. Prometheus therefore was occasionally reported to be the son of a virgin.

The Orphic poet pronounces him to be the same character as Cronus, or the transmigrating great father at the head of his triple offspring[5]: and, agreeably to this opinion, while Eusebius and Syncellus identify him with the demiurgic Nous or Mind; Proclus asserts, that this same Nous or Mind is no other than Cronus, and that the greatest Nous is Jupiter[6]. Prometheus then was the imaginary Soul of the world: and, as in the materializing system the great universal father was identified with that Soul, the proper name of the great father was transferred as a common name to the Soul. Hence, in the

[1] Hor. Od. lib. i. od. 3. ver. 27.

[2] Prom. Vinct. ver. 18.

[3] Ibid. ver. 209, 210.

[4] Hyg. Poet. Astron. lib. ii. c. 25. Martian. Capell. Satyric. lib. ii.

[5] Orph. Hymn. xii.

[6] Euseb. Hist. Synag. p. 374. Syncell. Chronog. p. 149. Proc. in Plat. Theog. lib. v. c. 5. p. 256.

Sanscrit, the Soul is denominated *Menu;* and, in the Greek, *Noös* or *Nous:* because the ancient character, who was the parent of three sons, who was preserved in an ark at the time of the general deluge, and who was feigned to be the demiurgic Mind, bore the name of *Nuh* or *Noah*[1]. In consequence of such an intermixture of ideas, three younger Noës or Minds are said, to have sprung from a single Nous who preceded them, and to have constituted that royal triad of Minds to whose sway the three divisions of the world were committed[2]. The very name indeed of Prometheus shews him to be the same as Nous or Menu: for, like each of those appellations, it denotes *Wisdom* or *Providence* or *Intellect*[3].

Yet, as he was the builder of the first ship, and as he flourished at the time of the deluge, he was sometimes also reported to have been one of the diluvian Cabiri and to have officiated as the priest of the navicular and mundane goddess Ceres[4]. Still however he is placed at an epoch far anterior to the deluge: for he is said to have been contemporary with Pandora the first-created woman, and to have flourished in the age which preceded the entrance of diseases

[1] Origin of Pagan Idol. book i. chap. 3. § III.

[2] Proc. in Plat. Tim. lib. ii. p. 94.

[3] See Prom. Vinct. ver. 85—87.

[4] Pausan. Boeot. p. 579.

and death into the world [1]. He is likewise said to have formed the first man and woman from a mixture of earth and water, and to have animated them with fire which he stole from heaven [2]. This story however, as we shall presently see, is told with a very remarkable variation.

Such was Prometheus: and it is easy to perceive, that his character is that of the great universal father who was revered as the most ancient king of every primitive nation, Adam transmigratively reappearing in the person of Noah.

2. But even this compound character does not comprehend the whole of his attributes.

As Adam and as Noah, he is placed in the recesses of mount Caucasus, because Paradise and Ararat alike constituted a district of that vast range: but there was yet a third person, who appeared under a human form in the same region, and who foretold that the Seed of the woman should bruise the head of the serpent though the serpent in return should bruise his heel or mortal part. Now the character of this third person also; a God, yet incarnate; a being of a nature infinitely superior to man, yet through love to man freely suffering pain and

[1] Hesiod. Theog. ver. 507—514, 571—593. Oper. et Dier. lib. i. ver. 59—107. Hor. Od. lib. i. od. 3. ver. 29—33.

[2] Apollod. Bibl. lib. i. c. 7. § 1.

ignomity; consigned to the grave, yet rising again triumphant; incapable in his own nature of death, yet by divine vengeance precipitated into Hades: the character of this third person also, handed down by long tradition from the first ages, enters largely into that of Prometheus.

3. Completely to develop this curious circumstance, it will be necessary to give an analysis of one of the most extraordinary productions which we have received from pagan antiquity; the drama of the Prometheus-Desmotes.

Jupiter, being determined to destroy the whole human race and to produce another in its room, withdrew from them the fire of vitality. None of the immortals dared to resist his purpose, save Prometheus alone: but he, animated by love and pity, brought down from heaven the lost fire, restored to men their forfeited lives, and saved them from being irrecoverably consigned to Hades. On this account, he was devoted to the severest corporeal sufferings. Pitying man, he yet received no pity himself: but he was publicly exposed, a lamentable spectacle both to gods and men of the wrath of Jupiter[1].

[1] Βροτων δε των ταλαιπωρων λογον
Ουκ εσχεν ουδεν· αλλ' αϊστωσας γενος
Το παν, εχρῃζεν ἄλλο φιτυσαι νεον.
Και τοισιν ουδεις αντεβαινε πλην εμε.
Εγω δ' ετολμησ'· εξερυσαμην βροτους
Τυ μη διαρραισθεντας εις ᾅδυ μολειν.
Τῳ τοι τοιαις δε πεμοναισι καμπτομαι,

Thus does Eschylus state the general subject of his drama: and the whole of it is in perfect accordance with this outline, save that certain personages are introduced, whose history relates to the mortal part of the character of Prometheus viewed as the transmigrating universal father.

The tragedy opens with the operation of fixing Prometheus to a rock of mount Caucasus by Vulcan and two allegorical personifications named *Strength* and *Violence*. Strength, who throughout sustains the part of a virulent accuser and enemy, states his offence to be a communication of vital fire to mankind: and he is, accordingly, declared to be punished on account of his benevolence to the human race[1]. Hence he is riveted in a painful posture to a solid rock; erect, unable to bend his knees, and debarred from the comfort of sleep: for, being a god himself, he feared not the anger of the gods; and he was therefore thus consigned to torture by the inflexibility of Jupiter, as a reward for his philanthropy[2].

In this situation he endures the bitter mockery of his professed foe. *Now let us see thee bestow*

> Πασχειν μεν αλγεινοισιν, οικτραισιν δ' ιδειν·
> Θνητες δ' εν οικτῳ προθεμενος, τυτε τυχειν
> Ουκ ηξιωθην αυτος, αλλ' ανηλεως
> Ὧδ' ερρυθμισμαι, Ζηνι δυσκλεης θεα.
>
> Prom. Vinct. ver. 31—41.

[1] Prom. Vinct. ver. 1—11.

[2] Ibid. ver. 19—34.

the high gifts of the gods on wretched mortals! Can those mortals liberate thee from thy present sufferings? The demons have falsely styled thee Prometheus *or* Providential Wisdom: *for thou thyself needest a* Prometheus *to teach thee how to escape from thy adverse fortune*[1].

Severe however as was the trial of the agonizing deity, it came not upon him unexpectedly. He had prophetically anticipated the whole of it: he had fully counted the cost. Yet this anticipation of torture did not prevent him from assisting mankind, when about to perish utterly through the wrath of Jupiter[2].

Bound nevertheless, and tortured, and dishonoured, still he claims to be a god; though a god, labouring under the hatred of Jupiter and all the other immortals on account of his too great love of mankind[3]. But, inflexible as Jupiter may be in exacting punishment from his victim, Prometheus expresses a full conviction that the time will come, when, laying aside his fierce indignation, he will even court his love; which love he himself will freely bestow upon his oppressor, writhing as he now may be under ineffable torments[4]. Thus persuaded of his future reconciliation, he is determined to bear

[1] Prom. Vinct. ver. 82—87.

[2] Ibid. ver. 102—113, 265—270, 31—34.

[3] Ibid. ver. 119—123, 542—544.

[4] Ibid. ver. 62, 63, 186—192.

his sufferings in patience until Jupiter shall lay aside his anger; sufferings indeed mysteriously stupendous, yet in strict accordance with the immutable laws of that deity by which he displays his power to the gods whom he has ejected from heaven[1].

While Prometheus is agonizing fast bound to the Caucasian rock, Ocean and his daughters, high as that rock towers above the level of the sea, are described as coming to sympathize with him, on the ground of their near relationship; he being a descendant of the Ocean, though the offspring of the virgin Themis or Terra or Astrèa. The maritime god, after specifying the vast range of country which he had passed over in order to reach him, declares, that he has no firmer friend than Ocean, none more willing to assist him in the day of trouble: and Prometheus, in return, expresses his surprize, how he could have left his native rocky caverns and the streams of the mighty waters to penetrate into a lofty inland country famed for its mines of iron[2].

In the course of his conversation with these personages and afterwards with Mercury, Prometheus foretells, that, as he himself had witnessed the dethronement of two former celestial kings Uranus and Cronus, so Jupiter, the

[1] Prom. Vinct. ver. 376, 377, 403—406.

[2] Ibid. ver. 128—143, 285—303.

third in succession, should himself likewise be dethroned by one yet more powerful. A descendant of his own shall eject him from the seat of empire; and the curse of his father Cronus shall then be accomplished. Confidently as he now may brandish the thunderbolt, it shall nothing avail him in the day of inevitable ruin. He is preparing a horrid portent against himself, whom he shall be unable to resist: a monster, who shall invent a flame more potent than the winged lightning, and who shall inflict a blow more vehement than the stroke of a thunderbolt; who shall utterly destroy the earth-shaking trident-sceptre of Neptune, and who shall teach the present sovereign of heaven the wide difference between rule and servitude[1].

With respect to his own character, as Prometheus makes himself far more ancient than Jupiter, having witnessed the primeval abdication of Uranus: so he claims to be that first of human beings; who, in his quality of the great universal father, conferred all manner of benefits on mankind. When men were in a rude state, seeing indeed but not perceiving, hearing indeed but not understanding, he it was, who reclaimed them and endowed them with intellect. He taught them to build houses: he instructed them in astronomy and arithmetic:

[1] Prom. Vinct. ver. 167—171, 905—925, 955, 956.

he invented letters: he joined horses to the yoke: he built the first ship: he was the original physician: he was the first prophet and onirocritic and diviner: he contrived the art of extracting brass and iron and silver and gold: in a word, mortals were indebted for every useful art to Prometheus [1].

In return, Ocean tells him, how he had beheld the prisoner in the Cilician cavern, the tremendous Typhon, who had resisted all the gods and who had threatened to subvert the empire of Jupiter himself, blasted with thunder and ultimately pinioned down to the earth beneath the mighty pressure of the burning mountain Etna [2].

While such discourse passes between them, the heifer Io, loved by Jupiter, persecuted by Juno, and impelled to incessant wanderings by the ghost of Argus, joins their company, and finds herself on the summit of the Caucasus [3]. She is described as the daughter of Inachus the son of Ocean; who flourished at a time, when Neptune and Juno contended for the sovereignty of the land, when Neptune produced a mighty deluge in consequence of Inachus having decided in favour of Juno, and when at length Juno persuaded him to cause the sea to retire

[1] Prom. Vinct. ver. 446—506.
[2] Ibid. ver. 351—373.
[3] Ibid. ver. 561—608.

within its natural limits[1]. Io, having gained the affection of Jupiter, was so disturbed by portentous dreams, that her father sent to consult the oracle: and the answer was, that he should drive her from his house and land, in order that she might thus freely ramble to the utmost extremities of the world; Jupiter threatening, in case of non-compliance, to destroy his whole family. Inachus obeyed: and Io, attended by the earth-born herdsman Argus, commenced her ramblings in the form of a cow[2]. Having first gone to Dodona, where the vocal oak unequivocally saluted her as the future consort of Jove, she passed to the sea, which from her received the name of *Ionian:* whence she afterward proceeded to that range of the Caucasus, where Prometheus was chained to the rock[3]. The course of her future ramblings from this place forms the subject of a prophecy of Prometheus: and, after marking out her progress through the land of the Scythians, he teaches her, that she shall at length reach the cataracts of the Ethiopic river; following the course of which, she shall descend to Canobus at the mouth of the Nile. Here, by the touch of Jupiter, she will become the mother of the

[1] Tzetz. in Lycoph. Cassan. ver. 177. Apollod. Bibl. lib. ii. c. 1. Paus. Corinth. p. 112.

[2] Prom. Vinct. ver. 640—686.

[3] Ibid. ver. 821—841.

sacred bull Epaphus or Apis, the supposed vehicle of the soul of Osiris [1].

The drama is now brought to a close by the entrance of Mercury, who comes as a messenger from Jupiter. He announces to Prometheus speedy destruction, unless he will prophetically declare the person by whom Jupiter is to be dethroned. *The eternal father*, says he, *will rend with lightning this rock to which thou art bound. He will hide thy body in the womb of the earth. A rocky cavern shall receive thee. Here shalt thou lie in darkness; until, after the completion of a long period of time, thou shalt ultimately be restored to the light of heaven* [2]. In reply Prometheus tells him, that he had fully anticipated the purport of his message; that he was prepared to endure the worst effects of Jupiter's indignation; and that he expected to be treated as an enemy: but still, even though all the elements should be involved in chaotic confusion, and though his body might through fatal necessity be plunged into the depths of Tartarus; still death should not have the complete mastery over him [3]. Matters having thus come to a final crisis the oceanic nymphs are exhorted to withdraw, lest they should be involved in the ap-

[1] Prom. Vinct. ver. 698—739, 784—817, 843—850. Herod. Hist. lib. ii. c. 153. Ovid. Metam. lib. i. ver. 748. Plutarch. de Isid. § 20.

[2] Ibid. ver. 1015—1020.

[3] Ibid. ver. 1039—1053.

proaching catastrophè: and the drama concludes with Prometheus sinking into Hades, while he calls upon his venerable mother to bear witness that he suffers undeservedly [1].

4. Such is the extraordinary drama of the Prometheus-Desmotes; such, the remarkably compounded character sustained by its hero. The key to the whole is that, which I have already specified.

Prometheus, from the attributes which are ascribed to him, is manifestly the transmigrating great father; that is to say, Adam reappearing (as the ancient hierophants pretended) in the person of Noah: and, in this point of view, he identifies himself successively with Uranus and Cronus; while Jupiter or (as the Egyptians called him) Ammon, who is represented as one of three brethren among whom the whole world was divided, and who is said to have dethroned his parent or to have established an universal empire in his own line, is certainly the scriptural Ham. Hence he is placed on the summit of mount Caucasus, one of the peaks of which was the Paradisiacal Ararat: hence he is at once made the son of the Earth and the descendant of the Ocean: hence the Ocean, quitting his natural domain, presents himself on the top of that mountain, which was tenanted by Prometheus: and hence the heifer Io, who is the

[1] Prom. Vinct. ver. 1071—1093.

same as the ship-goddess Isis, who is no other than the bovine ark within which Osiris was inclosed, who is the allegorical parent of the sacred bull which was deemed the visible representative of that god, who is placed under the guardianship of the infernal Argus or the ark-god while inclosed within his mystic coffin, and whose erratic progress over the whole world shadows out the wanderings of the Ark upon the surface of the diluvian sea, is brought likewise to that identical region where the Ark of Noah rested after the flood [1].

But, in the curious mythology of the Gentiles, the successive dethronement of the great patriarchs was transferred to an imaginary succession of similar mundane systems. According to their doctrine, as it is well observed by Cudworth, each cosmogony was no less a theogony. At the commencement of every world, the great father appeared incarnate, and became the universal parent both of gods and men. At the close of every world, a mighty deluge reduced all things to their primeval chaos: the inferior gods were absorbed into the essence of the great father: he himself, floating on the surface of the waters, sank into a death-like

[1] See Origin of Pagan Idol. book ii. chap. 6. § I. book iv. chap. 4. § I. book v. chap. 3. § I. 2. chap. 6. § IV, V. chap. 7. § III.

sleep: till at length, at the beginning of a new system, he appeared again in a new body, the successor of his former self; just as, at the beginning of the last system, he had stepped into the throne vacated by himself the predecessor of himself in a different body. To this grand catastrophè of a world, Eschylus, I think, very evidently alludes in his prophecy of the final dethronement of Jupiter by one armed with yet more powerful thunder; whose influence shall extend to the sea as well as to the land, and who with dreadful energy shall involve the whole universe in confusion. The notion is still set forth by the Hindoos in a strain of allegory, which bears a near resemblance to the doctrine as exhibited by the Greek poet. At the close of each world, a mighty demon, named *Maha-Pralaya* or *the Great Deluge*, swallows up both gods and men, dissolves the entire universe, and brings back the empire of chaos and old night. The reign of the Menu of that age is now at an end: but, when a new system emerges out of the turbid waters, a young Menu, another and yet the same, is constituted the universal sovereign of the nascent world, becomes the parent of three sons or emanations, and through them reproduces the whole race both of gods and of men and of animals. Precisely the same doctrine prevailed among the Goths, the children of those identical Scythians

whose lofty domain is the scene of the drama of Prometheus: and, among the Greeks, it was inculcated with equal zeal by the Stoics[1].

While however Prometheus thus appears as the transmigrating great father, there is a peculiarity in his character, which belongs neither to Adam nor to Noah nor to any other of the aboriginal patriarchs. He is described as suffering torture in his bodily frame, on account of his unexampled love to mankind. The ethereal spark of life, which they had lost, he restores to them; and thus preserves the whole race from being irremediably consigned to Hades. But *their* gain is *his* detriment. His sufferings he foresaw: but this did not deter him from his labour of benevolence. Though a god by nature, yet he is bruised in his mortal part by a malignant foe; who is allegorically represented under the title of *Strength*, and who with undisguised satisfaction exults in his sufferings. The whole however he bears with patience, looking out for the time, when, the justice of the eternal father being satisfied, he shall be fully reconciled to him. With this persuasion, he sinks into the womb of the earth. Yet, as a suffering god, he is incapable of proper death, He descends indeed into Hades: but the grave is unable to hold him permanently. At the close of a predetermined period, he is liberated

[1] See Origin of Pagan Idol. book i. chap. 2.

from the chambers of the tomb; and, being now fully reconciled to Jupiter, he emerges into the light and liberty of open day.

Here we have the character of the promised Deliverer, the anthropomorphic Jehovah, the virgin-born Seed whose mortal part was destined to be bruised by the infernal serpent, engrafted, from old tradition and in exact accordance with the notion that he was repeatedly incarnate in the persons of the early patriarchs, upon the character of the universal transmigrating father. Nor is this a solitary instance of such engraftation. As I have already observed, the sacrifice of the Indian Brahma, who is offered up and yet worshipped; the devotement of the Chinese victim-god Fo-Hi; the declared *mystical* oblation of his only son by the Phenician Il or Cronus; the self-immolation of Hercules, who is conspicuously depicted on the sphere trampling with his foot on the head of the great serpent; and the ancient Indian mode of representing the middle god Vishnou, similarly treading upon the head of the snake, while the snake bites his heel[1]; all these have originated from one and the same primeval source. So likewise, in Ocyrhoë's prophecy respecting the future character of the great universal physician Esculapius, we may

[1] See a most curious representation of Vishnou in this attitude in Maurice's Anc. Hist. of Hindost. vol. ii. p. 373. plate VIII.

evidently trace all the leading features of the Caucasian Prometheus. They were ultimately the same compound mythological personage: and I similarly account for the extraordinary sentiments entertained of them both[1].

I may briefly observe at the close of this discussion, that Eschylus peoples the region of Caucasus with the monstrous Phorcides and Gorgons and Gryphins; just as the Persians still make Caf the haunt of the wonderful Simorgh, and as the Hindoos place the winged semi-eagle Garuda at the eastern avenue of their Paradise in the recesses of their own Coosh or Caucasus[2]. The circumstance proves the remote antiquity of the fable. In point of origin, it sprang, I believe, from the portentous form of the Cherubim, which seem to have been permanently stationed on the eastern side of the holy mount until the primitive world was inundated by the waters of the deluge.

[1] Ergo ubi fatidicos concepit mente furores,
Incaluitque deo quem clausum pectore habebat;
Adspicit infantem: Totique salutifer orbi
Cresce, puer, dixit: tibi se mortalia sæpe
Corpora debebunt: animas tibi reddere ademptas
Fas erit. Idque semel, Dis indignantibus, ausus,
Poste dare hoc iterum flamma prohibebere avita:
Eque deo corpus fiet exsangue, deusque
Qui modo corpus eras: et bis tua fata novabis.
Ovid. Metam. lib. ii. ver. 640—648.

[2] Prom. Vinct. ver. 790—804.

CHAPTER VII.

RESPECTING THE NATURE OF THE ANTE-DILUVIAN APOSTASY.

But the sentiments of the Patriarchal Church, relative to the doctrine of an atonement to be effected by the sacrifice of the promised virgin-born Deliverer, may perhaps be yet further developed, if we can ascertain the nature of the antediluvian apostasy.

The existence of evil spirits, who envy the condition of God's redeemed people, who industriously tempt them to the commission of sin, who exult over them when they sometimes fall, and who delight to traverse all the gracious plans of a merciful and beneficent Creator, is repeatedly set forth to us, throughout the volume of the New Testament, in terms abundantly explicit and unequivocal. Their prince, from his characteristic disposition, is ordinarily denominated *Satan* or *the Adversary:* he is described, as having brought condemnation upon himself by reason of his being lifted up with pride: his associates are represented, as constituting a

well-organized community, ever ready to act conjointly and thus to forward their mutual purposes of evil: they are said to unite great power and ferocity to the most refined subtilty: and they appear to be so numerous, that we read even of a single unhappy subject being demoniacally possessed by a whole legion of them.

In the Old Testament, their existence and attributes are not revealed with equal clearness: yet, an elaborate and well digested plan of seduction being ascribed to the serpent at the very commencement of the Pentateuch, and no similar power of contrivance and action being possessed by any literal reptile of that tribe, we should be irresistibly led to conclude, even if further light had not been thrown upon the matter in any other part of Scripture, that no *mere* serpent was intended, but that some malignant spiritual tempter had been permitted to lurk under the form of that animal and to carry on a project of mischief through the medium of his organs. This, I say, we should be led to conclude from the very reason of the thing, even independently of any ulterior information: the New Testament however silences every doubt, by teaching us, that the old serpent, or the serpent mentioned of old in the word of God, which deceiveth the whole world, is called *the devil* and *Satan*[1].

[1] Rev. xii. 9.

Such is the unseen enemy, on account of whose mingled power and malignity St. Peter gives us a most awful warning and admonition: *Be sober, be vigilant; because your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour*[1].

To the fall of this enemy, at the head of those heavenly bands whom he had seduced into a mad rebellion against God, St. Jude has been commonly thought to refer in a very remarkable passage which occurs in his general epistle. *The angels, which kept not their first estate but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day*[2]. And, as the passage of St. Jude has been thus understood, a manifestly parallel passage in the second epistle of St. Peter has been ordinarily supposed to have a similar allusion. *God spared not the angels that sinned; but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment*[3]. Yet, notwithstanding the general consent with regard to the import of these two texts, when thoroughly sifted, there may perhaps be reason more than to doubt, whether they have the slightest relation to the fall of Satan and his confederates.

I. The context of the passage in St. Jude will furnish us with a key, both to its own

[1] 1 Peter v. 9. [2] Jude 6.
[3] 2 Peter ii. 4.

interpretation, and to that of the parallel passage in St. Peter: with this it will therefore be proper for us to commence.

1. Now I am inclined to think, that it will be no very difficult matter to shew, that the persons, here mentioned by St. Jude, whoever they may be, at all events cannot possibly be disembodied spirits: whence it will follow, that they are not the Satanic host.

It is probable, that the common belief, at least in England, that such is their character, would never have prevailed, if our translators had not, *in the first place*, given a particular sense to a word of general import; and if, *in the second place*, they had not wholly omitted a most important masculine pronoun, which occurs in the original Greek.

(1.) The word of general import, to which they have given a particular sense, is that which they have rendered *angels*.

I do not mean to say, that such a version is absolutely inaccurate: the English word *angels* doubtless expresses a sense of the corresponding Greek word as it is used both by the Seventy and by the writers of the New Testament: but then the English word is a term of very limited import, while the Greek word is a term of much more extensive signification. In our own language, we rarely use the word *angel*, except as designing to express *a spirit, whether good or bad, who was never, like man, permanently embodied in a*

vehicle of flesh. But, in the Greek, the word *angelus*, though it bears indeed such a sense Hellenistically, is far from being restricted to it: on the contrary, its proper and original import is *a messenger who conveys tidings.* A ministering spirit of God therefore is so denominated, not at all in reference to his essential nature, but merely in reference to his official character: he is styled *angelus*, not because he is a spirit, but because he is a messenger. Such being the case, it is evident, that any other person, who acts as a messenger, may just as properly in Greek be called *angelus;* though, from our restricted use of the term *angel*, we should not call him *an angel* in English.

Hence, if the Greek word, which in the passage from St. Jude is rendered *the angels*, had been rendered *the messengers*, it is plain, that a very different idea would have been excited in the mind of an English reader from that which is now generally excited. Consequently, our translators, in rendering the Greek word *angels*, do, in effect, beg the question. They *assume* the apostle to speak of disembodied spirits: when, in reality, it is *a priori* a matter of doubt whether he does or does not: for he uses a term; which in the Greek denotes *messengers* of any description, whether spiritual or corporeal.

(2.) Which of the two he here means, must be determined of course by the general context: but then we must refer to the context, as it

appears in the original Greek; for our English translators have omitted a very important masculine pronoun, which in fact decides the question.

The pronoun, which they have omitted, is the dative masculine *to these*[1]: and the omission occurs after the words *in like manner*, which will be found in the verse that immediately follows the passage under discussion. This verse they have thus imperfectly rendered.

Even as Sodom and Gomorrha and the cities about them, IN LIKE MANNER *giving themselves over to fornication and going after strange flesh, are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire*[2].

Now, by such a translation, they have given a totally different turn to the whole clause from what it exhibits in the original: for any person, who reads this English sentence, will suppose, both from the phraseology and from the punctuation, that the words, IN LIKE MANNER, relate to *Sodom and Gomorrha;* that is to say, he will suppose the passage to intimate, that the cities about Sodom and Gomorrha, giving themselves over to fornication IN LIKE MANNER *to Sodom and Gomorrha,* were thence with them set forth for an example. But the original Greek is incapable of any such meaning: for *there* the words, rendered IN LIKE MANNER, do not

[1] Gr. τοιοις.

[2] Jude 7.

relate to *Sodom and Gomorrha*, but to the masculine pronoun *these* which our translators have altogether omitted. The passage itself, when rendered perfectly by inserting the now omitted masculine pronoun in question, will run as follows.

Even as Sodom and Gomorrha and the cities about them, IN LIKE MANNER TO THESE *giving themselves over to fornication and going after strange flesh, are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire.*

Here the words, IN LIKE MANNER, relate to the masculine pronoun THESE, not to SODOM AND GOMORRHA.

Still a mere English reader might imagine, that the sense was just the same as it was before: because he might conceive, that the pronoun THESE related to SODOM AND GOMORRHA; so that, when the cities are said to have given themselves over to fornication *in like manner to these*, it means, that they gave themselves over to fornication *in like manner to Sodom and Gomorrha.* But a single view of the original Greek will shew its incapability of bearing any such sense. Sodom and Gomorrha, considered as cities, are *feminine;* whence the pronoun THEM, which *truly* relates to them, as it occurs in the clause *the cities about* THEM, is feminine also: but the subsequent demonstrative pronoun THESE, as it occurs in the clause *in like manner to* THESE, is *masculine;* whence, whatever may

be intended by THESE, it is clear, that the cities Sodom and Gomorrha cannot be intended, but on the contrary certain *masculine* agents.

Even as Sodom and Gomorrha, and the cities about THEM (that is, about Sodom and Gomorrha) *in like manner to* THESE (that is, in like manner, not to Sodom and Gomorrha, but to certain masculine agents; who, from the use of the pronoun *these*, must have been previously mentioned by the apostle) *giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, are set forth for an example.*

Who then are the masculine agents; to whom, as persons already mentioned by him, St. Jude refers in his use of the masculine pronoun THESE? If we look back, we shall find none, to whom the pronoun can relate, except the ANGELI spoken of in the preceding verse.

The ANGELI, *which kept not their first estate but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day: even as Sodom and Gomorrha and the cities about* THEM (that is, about Sodom and Gomorrha), *in like manner to* THESE (that is in like manner to the ANGELI) *giving themselves over to fornication and going after strange flesh, are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire*[1].

[1] The original Greek is much more distinct, than any naked English translation can be: because the Greek expresses the

Thus it appears, when the entire sentence is faithfully exhibited, that the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrha and the neighbouring cities are compared, in point of the nature of their specific criminality, to certain persons, whom St. Jude styles ANGELI. Hence it is manifest, that these ANGELI must have been guilty of the very same abominations as those, which pulled down the righteous vengeance of heaven upon the cities of the plain: and, accordingly, they are each described as being consigned to the same punishment. But, tremendous as the depravity of Satan and his associates may be; such depravity, from the very consititution of their nature, is altogether *spiritual.* It is utterly impossible, that *they* should ever have been polluted with the *corporeal* sins of Sodom and Gomorrha: and we must not omit to observe, that it is of these *corporeal* sins that the apostle is specifically speaking; *giving themselves over to* FORNICATION, *and going after* STRANGE FLESH. Hence we may be sure, that, let the ANGELI mentioned by St. Jude be who they may, they at any rate cannot be those evil *spirits*, the fallen

genders of the pronouns, which the English is incapable of doing. ΑΓΓΕΛΟΥΣ *τε τυς μη τηρησαντας την ἑαυτων αρχην, αλλα απολιποντας το ιδιον οικητηριον, εις κρισιν μεγαλης ἡμερας δεσμοις αϊδιοις ὑπο ζοφον τετηρηκεν· ὡς Σοδομα και Γομορρα και ἁι περι* ΑΥΤΑΣ (scil. *πολεις Σοδομα και Γομορρα*) *πολεις, τον ὁμοιον* ΤΟΥΤΟΙΣ (scil. ΑΓΓΕΛΟΙΣ) *τροπον εκπορνευσασαι και απελθυσαι ὁπισω σαρκος ἑτερας, προκειται δειγμα, πυρος αιωνιυ δικην ὑπεχυσαι.*

angels: because they are represented as being addicted to the identical *corporeal* abominations which disgraced the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrha.

Such being the case, our translators certainly did not express the sense of the original, when, in the present passage, they rendered the Greek word, which the apostle uses, by the English word ANGELS: because the introduction of that English word in the first clause, and the suppression of the masculine pronoun THESE in the second clause, lead the incautious reader to suppose, that the devils or fallen angels are the persons meant by St. Jude.

2. The sense of the passage being thus *negatively* ascertained as it occurs in the Epistle of St. Jude, we shall thence be enabled similarly to ascertain also its *negative* sense, as it occurs in the second Epistle of St. Peter: for, to establish the evident parallelism of the two passages, we need only compare them together. But, as there are various matters to be elucidated in each of them, it will be proper to give them severally at full length.

(1.) I shall first adduce the entire passage with its whole context, as it appears in the Epistle of St. Jude.

Beloved, when I gave all diligence to write unto you of the common salvation: it was needful for me to write unto you and exhort you, that ye should

earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints. For there are certain men crept in unawares, who were before of old set forth in writing[1] *to this condemnation, ungodly men, turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness, and denying the only Lord God and our Lord Jesus Christ. I will therefore put you in remembrance, though ye once knew this, how that the Lord, having saved the people out of the land of Egypt, afterwards destroyed them that believed not. And the* ANGELI, *which kept not their first estate but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day: even as Sodom and Gomorrha and the cities about them, in like manner to* THESE (ANGELI) *giving themselves over to fornication and going after strange flesh, are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire. Likewise also these filthy dreamers defile the flesh, despise dominion, and speak evil of dignities. Yet Michael the* CHIEF ANGELUS, *when contending with the devil he dis-*

[1] Gr. προγεγραμμενοι. The meaning is, not that they were doomed to this condemnation by any arbitrary decree, but that their own appearance and their future sentence were foretold by Enoch, whose prophecy had come down in writing among the traditions of the Levitical Church. Compare ver. 14, 15. This prophecy, though not recorded by Moses in the Pentateuch, is recognized by the inspired apostle St. Jude as an authentic oracle. We are bound therefore to receive it as canonical.

puted about the body of Moses, did not think proper[1] *to bring against him a railing accusation; but said, The Lord rebuke thee. But these speak evil of those things, which they know not: but, what they know naturally as brute beasts, in those things they corrupt themselves. Woe unto them! For they have gone in the way of Cain, and have run greedily after the error of Balaam for reward, and have perished in the gainsaying of Korah. These are spots in your feasts of charity, when they feast with you, feeding themselves without fear: clouds they are without water, carried about of winds; trees whose fruit withereth without fruit, twice dead, plucked up by the roots; raging waves of the sea, foaming out their own shame; wandering stars, to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness for ever. And Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying; Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousands of his saints, to execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed and of all their hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against him. These are murmurers, complainers, walking after their own lusts; and their mouth speaketh great swelling words, having men's persons in admiration because of advantage. But, beloved, remember ye the words which were spoken before of the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ: how that they told you, there should be*

[1] Gr. ουκ ετολμησε.

mockers in the last time, who should walk after their own ungodly lusts. These be they who separate themselves, sensual, having not the Spirit[1].

(2.) Let us next attend to the evidently parallel passage, with its context also, as written by St. Peter.

But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you; who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction. And many shall follow their pernicious ways, by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of. And through covetousness shall they with feigned words make merchandise of you: whose judgment now of a long time lingereth not, and their damnation slumbereth not. For, if God spared not the ANGELI *that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment; and spared not the old world, but saved Noah the eighth person, a preacher of righteousness, bringing in the flood upon the world of the ungodly; and, turning the cities of Sodom and Gomorrha into ashes, condemned them with an overthrow, making them an ensample unto those that after them should live ungodly; and delivered just Lot, vexed with the filthy conversation of the wicked (for that righteous man, dwelling among them, in seeing and hearing, vexed his righteous soul from day to day with their*

[1] Jude 3—19.

unlawful deeds): the Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptation, and to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished; but chiefly them, that walk after the flesh in the lust of uncleanness and despise government. Presumptuous are they, self-willed, they are not afraid to speak evil of dignities. Whereas the ANGELI, *which are greater in power and might, bring not a railing accusation against them before the Lord. But these, as natural brute beasts made to be taken and destroyed, speak evil of the things that they understand not, and shall utterly perish in their own corruption, and shall receive the reward of unrighteousness as they count it pleasure to riot in the day-time. Spots they are and blemishes, sporting themselves with their own deceivings while they feast with you; having eyes full of adultery and that cannot cease from sin, beguiling unstable souls. An heart they have exercised with covetous practices, cursed children. Which have forsaken the right way and are gone astray, following the way of Balaam the son of Bosor, who loved the wages of unrighteousness; but was rebuked for his iniquity: the dumb ass, speaking with man's voice, forbade the madness of the prophet. These are wells without water, clouds that are carried with a tempest, to whom the mist of darkness is reserved for ever. For, when they speak great swelling words of vanity, they allure through the lusts of the flesh, through much wantonness, those that were clean escaped from them who live in error. While they promise them liberty, they themselves are the*

servants of corruption: for, of whom a man is overcome, of the same he is brought in bondage. For, if after they have escaped the pollutions of the world through the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, they are again entangled therein and overcome; the latter end is worse with them than the beginning. For it had been better for them not to have known the way of righteousness, than, after they have known it, to turn from the holy commandment delivered unto them[1].

3. It is abundantly clear, that these two parallel passages relate to persons of the same description, and that they exemplify both their character and their punishment by an exactly similar mode of illustration. Some such men, it seems, had made their appearance in the apostolic age: and others like them are foretold, as about to rise up and disturb the world *in the last time*, or during the period which was shortly to precede the great day of the second advent and the close of the predicted *times of the Gentiles*.

Now these persons are to be distinguished by

[1] 2 Peter ii. 1—21. Respecting the canonical authority of the second Epistle of St. Peter, see Bishop Sherlock's Dissert. i. postfixed to his Discourses on Prophecy. If we allow, that both Peter and Jude took the particulars here recited from some ancient Jewish document, still, by fixing the stamp of their own inspiration upon them, they have indisputably established their authority. The only point to be determined, therefore, is, what facts they recite.

a denial of the only Lord God and our Lord Jesus Christ; by an unrestrained licentiousness and profligacy of manners, insomuch that they should not only *do* evil, but even *vindicate* and *patronise* it; and by standing up against God's appointed ministers both in Church and State, so that they should openly speak evil of dignities whether ecclesiastical or civil, and accustom themselves in the malice of their hearts to bring railing accusations against them.

Agreeably to this their mixed character, they are at once compared to the impious antediluvians, the last generation of whom perished in the flood; to the abandoned inhabitants of Sodom and the neighbouring cities, whose systematic profligacy at length provoked the vengeance of the Omnipotent; to the Israelites, who were brought indeed out of Egypt, but who afterwards perished in the wilderness; and lastly, both by Jude and Peter, to certain persons whom they agree in denominating ANGELI, and who are declared to have been polluted with abominations similar to those of Sodom and Gomorrha. All these, more or less resembling each other in point of wickedness, are said to be reserved for the same punishment unto the judgment of the great day; that so they might be set forth, as an example of God's righteous indignation against sin, to all his intelligent creatures.

4. Since the persons, thus amply described,

and thus specially compared both by Jude and Peter to those whom they denominate ANGELI, are spoken of, partly as living in the apostolic age, and partly as about to be revealed at a then future period, our search after them must be two-fold.

(1.) With regard to the contemporaries of the apostles, I think it very evident, that the paganizing heretics of the Gnostic school, among the first of whom was Simon Magus, are the persons intended.

These made void the whole scheme of the Gospel, by introducing another Messiah instead of the true one, by declaring that the incarnate Saviour was no other than the repeatedly incarnate great father of gentile theology, and by maintaining that he did not really die on the cross for the sins of mankind. They were likewise addicted to the vilest abominations, under the specious plea, that no outward deeds of the body could pollute the independent ethereal soul [1]. Persons of this description are without doubt, I think, those individual antichrists; whom St. John speaks of as contemporary with himself, and whom he represents exactly like the persons condemned by St. Jude as denying both the Father and the Son [2].

(2.) St. Peter however speaks of such men,

[1] See Horæ Mosaic. book ii. sect. ii. chap. 2.

[2] 1 John ii. 18, 22.

as being still *future* at the time when he wrote: and the account, which he gives of them (particularly when his language is checked by that of St. Jude), so nearly resembles the description given by Daniel of the wilful king who should rise up in the last age and who should perish between the two seas of Palestine synchronically with the restoration of the Jews; that we can scarcely hesitate to pronounce the wilful king or kingdom a whole community of persons animated by the same sentiments as those which characterized the individual antichrists of the apostolic age[1].

This profligate and infidel community I take to be the great and long-expected Antichrist of the last days: and I need scarcely observe, that precisely such a community has started into existence in these our own portentous times; that is to say, at the very period, when from the sure word of prophecy its manifestation might be anticipated. For, to adopt the excellent remark of Bishop Hurd, even if we do not inquire too curiously into the precise chronological point when the 1260 years of Daniel and St. John commenced, but if we content ourselves with simply turning to the history of the middle ages; we shall find, that a notoriously corrupt ecclesiastical power has been established in the seven-hilled city at the least

[1] Compare 2 Peter ii. with Dan. xi. 36—39.

twelve centuries: consequently, in the present day, we cannot be very far removed from the close of that famous prophetic period, whatever may be the *exact* date of its commencement[1]. But, *toward* its close, the great Antichrist is to be developed: for we are taught, that he is to perish *subsequent* to its close and *synchronically* with the yet future restoration of Judah. Hence it is plain, that we are living in the very days, which prophecy sets forth as the peculiar age of the great Antichrist: and we need only turn to passing events, if we wish to be convinced how accurately it has been accomplished. We have seen the rise of a Power, which has rejected with scorn the Christian doctrine of *the atonement*, which has addicted itself systematically to every excess of lawless violence, and which has openly legalized both in principle and in practice the most barefaced and enormous profligacy of manners.

5. To such times as these our Lord alludes, when he emphatically asks whether he shall find faith upon the earth in the day of his second coming[2]: and yet more pointedly, in another place, does he compare the times of lust and violence, which immediately preceded the deluge, to the similar period which ushers in the coming of the Son of man[3].

[1] Bishop Hurd's Introduct. to the study of proph. serm. xi. p. 190—194.

[2] Luke xviii. 8.

[3] Ibid. xvii. 26, 27.

Now, if the antediluvian times resembled the times immediately before the second advent; then must they have been characterized, not only by lust and violence, but likewise by a daring spirit of apostate infidelity, that very spirit which the apostle denominates *the spirit of Antichrist.*

Accordingly, both the distinctive marks of those wicked men described so graphically by Jude and Peter, and the comparison instituted between them and various ancient persons recorded in Holy Scripture, will equally lead us to the very same conclusion. They were to be profligate and lawless: and, at the same time, they were to be characterized by their open rejection of the promised Messiah; or, as our Lord speaks, they were so to disseminate their irreligious principles, that in the day of his second coming he should scarcely find any remainder of faith upon the earth. Such are their distinctive marks: and, by way of further illustration, they are compared to the antediluvians, to the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrha, to the Israelites who were brought indeed out of Egypt but who afterwards perished in the wilderness, to Balaam the unrighteous prophet, and to the factious anarch Korah.

Out of these several examples, it is easy to select those, with which the antichristian individuals, stigmatized by Jude and Peter, were to

correspond in point of lawlessness and profligacy: but, unless we suppose the antediluvians to have been specially mentioned as the instance of open infidelity, we shall vainly seek an example with which the antichrists will correspond in point of their denying the only Lord God and our Lord Jesus Christ. Hence we are obliged to infer, agreeably to our Saviour's own intimation, that the times before the deluge were marked by that same want of faith, as will eminently distinguish the times immediately before his second advent to judge the antichristian faction and to deliver his chosen people. In other words, the antediluvians were possessed by that spirit of Antichrist, which originated, if I mistake not, with the fratricide Cain: for Cain, by rejecting the appointed typical rite of bloody piacular sacrifice, declared his rejection of the antitypical atonement by the future sacrifice of the woman's Seed; and he was thence led to frame for himself and for his impious descendants a religion, which denied the Messiah and which excluded God from the world that he had created [1].

II. But we must not forget, that, in addition to these illustrative examples which have just been considered, both the individual antichrists of the apostolic age, and the great national

[1] See Origin of Pagan Idol. book ii. chap. 8. § II. 4. and Horæ Mosaic. book ii. sect. iii. chap. 2. § I. 1, 2.

Antichrist of the last days, are likened by Jude and Peter to certain ANGELI, who are themselves declared to have been polluted with the grossest corporeal abominations. Hitherto, by carefully developing the peculiar immoral character of these ANGELI, we have only been enabled to pronounce *negatively*, that they are *not* the spiritual fallen angels, even Satan and his rebellious associates: we have now to inquire *positively*, who and what persons they truly *are*.

1. For this purpose it will be useful to begin with ascertaining the proper sense of the term ANGELI, as it here occurs.

(1.) The Greek word ANGELUS, as I have already had occasion to observe, really and primarily signifies *a messenger who brings intelligence:* and it is only applied secondarily to those spiritual beings, whom we in English are wont exclusively to call *angels*, because they are the messengers whom God employs to execute his high commissions. Exactly the same, in the Old Testament, is the sense of the Hebrew word MALACH; which our English translators for the most part render by the word ANGEL; and, as our derivative word *angel*, by a narrowed signification, is used ordinarily, perhaps exclusively, to denote *a created spiritual being;* I am inclined to think, that, by thus for the most part rendering the Hebrew word, they have for the most part rendered it errone-

ously, because they have made it convey an *exclusive* idea which very frequently it does *not* convey.

Throughout the entire Old Testament, the second person of the Blessed Trinity is denominated *the* MALACH *of Jehovah:* a title, which our translators generally render *the* ANGEL *of the Lord,* and sometimes (what is still more improper) *an* ANGEL *of the Lord*[1]. That this Being however is God, notwithstanding he is described as conveying the behests of Jehovah, is manifest, both from the circumstance of his being himself denominated *Jehovah,* and from the express declaration of Jacob that he was the Deity of his fathers Abraham and Isaac[2]. Hence, when the exclusive sense of the English word *angel* is considered, it would have been more proper, if the original had been uniformly translated *The* MESSENGER *of Jehovah.* By St. John the same divine person is styled *a mighty* ANGELUS[3]. Here again it might have been better, if the original Greek had been rendered *a mighty* MESSENGER: for the term *angel,* in our sense of the word, is plainly inapplicable to Christ. Accordingly, there is one passage, in which the Messiah is so clearly intended, that

[1] They likewise write the word *angel,* when thus combined, with a small initial letter, as if yet more pointedly to mark out the person so designated to be only a *created* being.

[2] Gen. xlviii. 15, 16.

[3] Rev. x. 1.

our translators have there described him as *the* MESSENGER *of the covenant;* for they felt, that in this case our English idiom would make it obviously improper to speak of him as *the* ANGEL *of the covenant:* yet the Hebrew word is the very same as that, which, when combined with the name *Jehovah,* they constantly render either *the* ANGEL or *an* ANGEL *of the Lord*[1]. As Christ however is not only the messenger, but the special and preëminent Messenger, of God the Father; it is natural to expect, that he would be sometimes distinguished by a term peculiarly expressive of his high function. And, such, if I mistake not, we shall find to be the case in more than one passage of Holy Writ. The character of Michael, whenever that great potentate is mentioned, is drawn in colours so very remarkable, that he has been pronounced with much reason to be no other than Christ himself, the mighty ANGEL or rather MESSENGER of Jehovah: for, as he throughout sustains the identical offices attributed to the Messiah, and as none inferior to the Messiah *could* sustain them; the consequence seems almost inevitable, that they are one and the same person[2]. Now this exalted being is styled *the* ARCHANGELUS: whence, from the common unfortunate presumption that an ANGEL must needs mean *a created*

[1] Malach. iii. 1.

[2] Bishop Horsley's Serm. vol. ii. serm. 29. p. 419—426.

spiritual and unembodied intelligence, Michael, without a shadow of warrant from Scripture, has been ordinarily deemed the highest of such created intelligences, and has been duly marshalled as the warlike captain of the Lord's angelic army. Yet, neither that character, nor that title, belongs to any created being. *The captain of the Lord's host,* who appeared to Joshua, who received divine worship from him, and who in the very style used by God himself to Moses commanded the Hebrew chieftain to loose his shoe from off his foot because the place whereon he stood was holy: this *captain of the Lord's host* is certainly no mere created angel, but he who is usually denominated *the* MESSENGER *of Jehovah,* he *in whom is the name of Jehovah* himself[1]. Thus it appears, that the true captain of the celestial host is no created chief angel, but the uncreated Word of God: and, as this great prince, who is generally styled *the* ANGEL or MESSENGER *of Jehovah,* bears also, in his character of Michael, the compound title of ARCHANGELUS; we seem to be required, by every rule of analogy, to understand the compound title after the same manner as the uncompounded title. Hence, as the uncompounded title manifestly exhibits the second person of the Holy Trinity as the MES-

[1] Josh. v. 14, 15. Exod. xxiii. 20, 21. See Horæ Mósaic. book ii. sect. i. chap. 2. § II. 3, 1.

SENGER of Jehovah; I think it most natural to conclude, that the compound title represents him as the CHIEF MESSENGER of the Lord and consequently as the divine president of all God's inferior messengers. To this CHIEF MESSENGER of Jehovah the office of judging both the quick and the dead is allotted by the eternal Father. We read accordingly, that *the Lord* Jesus *himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the* CHIEF MESSENGER, *and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first* [1].

Now the idea, with which Christ is styled *the* MESSENGER *of Jehovah*, has no relation whatsoever to the blessed angels: it refers entirely to his covenant-office in regard to man; whence in one place he is denominated *the* MESSENGER *of the covenant*. Such being the case, since he is with the same reference called ARCHANGELUS or *the* CHIEF MESSENGER; we may venture to conclude, that it is still on the same ground that certain agents subordinate to him are sometimes called ANGELI or MESSENGERS. But, if these agents are so called with the same reference that he himself is thus similarly designated, they must be so called in special reference to the covenant-office of Christ: and consequently, as he is not denominated MALACH and ARCHANGELUS with any reference to the created

[1] 1 Thessal. iv. 16.

angels that surround the throne of God; so neither can they be denominated ANGELI, as being themselves those identical glorious spirits. The force of this analogical reasoning will the more lucidly appear, if we consider another scriptural title of Christ. St. Peter calls him ARCHIPOEMEN or CHIEF SHEPHERD, just as St. Jude calls him ARCHANGELUS or CHIEF MESSENGER [1]. Hence we may be sure, that all the inferior messengers bear exactly the same relation to him as chief messenger, that all the inferior shepherds bear to him as chief shepherd. The inferior shepherds however are plainly no unembodied spirits, but his mortal officiating ministers appointed to feed his flock: and he himself, as we have seen, is styled MALACH and ARCHANGELUS, not with any reference to the angelic host, but solely as the GREAT MESSENGER of the covenant. It will follow therefore, that the inferior messengers are in like manner no unembodied spirits, but simply his mortal officiating ministers; who similarly, though subordinately, to himself bear to fallen man the gracious tidings of God's covenanted mercy.

Accordingly we find his mere mortal servants thus designated, both under the Law and under the Gospel. Thus John the Baptist is styled *God's* MESSENGER in the very same prophetic

[1] 1 Peter v. 4. Jude 9.

sentence that Christ is denominated *the* MESSENGER *of the covenant;* and thus, when the evangelists quote and apply this prediction, they still distinguish the precursor of the Messiah by the same appropriate title of *God's* MESSENGER: yet the word, both in the Hebrew and in the Greek, though our translators very sensibly render it MESSENGER, is the precise word which they elsewhere perpetually render ANGEL; so that, as far as literal phraseology goes, the spirit Gabriel who saluted the Virgin, and the glorious beings who met Jacob at Mahanaim, are not more positively denominated ANGELS than John the Baptist, for they are all distinguished by the self-same term both in Greek and in Hebrew[1]. Thus again Haggai is styled *the Lord's* MESSENGER, or, if we choose so to translate the original, *the Lord's* ANGEL[2]. Thus a priest is said to be *the* ANGEL or MESSENGER *of the Lord of hosts;* and that too by a prophet, who himself officially bears the name of *Malachi*, that is, *the* ANGEL or *the* MESSENGER[3]. Thus likewise each presiding bishop of

[1] Malach. iii. 1. Matt. xi. 10. Mark i. 2. Luke vii. 27. i. 26. Gen. xxxii. 1, 2.

[2] Haggai i. 13.

[3] Malach. ii. 7. From the circumstance of the prophet being named *Malachi*, some of the fathers idly fancied that he was actually an angel in our common English sense of the word *angel*. To this notion they were probably led by the version of the lxx; who, in Malach. i. 1, render what we have

the seven churches of Asia is still, in the original Greek, denominated ANGELUS; a title, which our translators throughout the three first chapters of the Apocalypse have thought proper to render *the* ANGEL as if the word were somewhat mystical, but which they might just as accurately have expressed *the* MESSENGER of this church or of that church[1]. And thus finally the active missionaries or agents, whom the great maritime people of the last ages is to send by sea with papyrine volumes, the volumes most probably of Scripture, are styled by Isaiah MALACHIM or ANGELS or (as our translators have properly rendered the word) MESSENGERS[2].

been accustomed to deem a proper name εν χειρι ΑΓΓΕΛΟΥ αυτου. But, even if we *do* suppose the word *Malachi* not to be a proper name, still the version of the lxx will give no countenance to this foolish gloss of the fathers: for, in that case, the meaning will simply be *by the hand of his* MESSENGER; that is to say, by the hand of an anonymous prophet who is called *God's* MESSENGER by virtue of his office. Some accordingly, who with the Greek translators deny the word to be a proper name, have supposed this anonymous prophetic MESSENGER to be Ezra. See Dr. Gray's Key to the Old Test. p. 505, 506.

[1] Rev. i. 20. ii. 1, 8, 12, 18. iii. 1, 7, 14.

[2] *Ho! Land of the perpetual shadow of sails, which art beyond the rivers of Cush! Accustomed to send ambassadors by sea, even with papyrine volumes upon the surface of the waters. Go, ye swift* MESSENGERS, *unto a nation dragged away and plucked.* Isaiah xviii. 1, 2. So the Seventy.

(2.) This view of the matter will lead us to a right understanding of several rather perplexed passages in Holy Writ.

Ουαι γης πλοιων πτερυγες, επεκεινα ποταμων Αιθιοπιας· ὁ αποστελλων εν θαλασσῃ ὀμηρα, και επιστολας βιβλινας επανω τȣ ὑδατος· πορευσονται γαρ ΑΓΓΕΛΟΙ κουφοι προς εθνος μετεωρον.

In this passage, what I have rendered, after the Seventy, *with papyrine volumes,* Bishop Horsley renders *in bulrush vessels,* understanding by the phrase *light-sailing ships:* but I doubt, whether the original Hebrew be capable of bearing his translation. In English indeed, we familiarly use the word *vessel* to denote *a ship:* but it may be questioned, whether the Hebrew word כלי, any more than the Latin word *vas,* will bear such a sense. Extensive and general as the Hebrew term is in its import, I doubt whether it will ever be found to occur in the signification of *a ship.* The word, attached to it in the present passage, most naturally leads to some such version as that of the Seventy: whence I would translate the whole phrase *implements of papyrus,* understanding by it *papyrine volumes* or *books made of paper.*

With Bishop Horsley, I think that a maritime nation is here described; though I do not build my opinion upon precisely the same part of the prophecy, as his lordship. The peculiar character of the nation I deduce from the first clause; which I translate *Ho! land of the perpetual shadow of sails,* as the Seventy translate it Ουαι γης πλοιων πτερυγες: not from the clause, which the bishop renders *bulrush vessels,* but which I conceive ought rather to be rendered *implements of papyrus* or *papyrine volumes.*

Should the view, which I have given of the entire passage, be accurate, the predicted maritime nation will be known by its extraordinary activity in conveying over the sea, by the hand of certain ambassadors or agents, what the Seventy denominate *Bibline Epistles* or *Papyrine Books:* and, since its office, so far as the Jews are concerned, is manifestly of a

We read for instance, that *the woman ought to have power on her head because of the* ANGELS; that is to say, as our translators rightly observe in the margin, *she ought to wear a covering on her head in token of her inferiority to the man*[1]. But why then ought she to do this *because of the* ANGELS? What, it may well be asked, have *the* ANGELS to do in the affair? I see not what satisfactory answer can be given, if by these ANGELS we are to understand *pure unembodied spirits:* but let the word be only translated MESSENGERS, and by such MESSENGERS let us understand *God's officiating ministers;* and the whole difficulty will vanish at once. In the context, St. Paul begins with stating, that *the head of every man is Christ, and the head of the woman is the man, and the head of Christ is God.* He then gives directions, that all those men in the primitive Church, who prayed or prophesied, should officiate with their heads uncovered; but that all the women, who were similarly led by the extraordinary influence of the Spirit to pray or to prophecy, should officiate with their heads covered. And he then adds, that *for this cause ought a woman to have*

theological nature; and since therefore the ambassadors or agents, who are afterwards styled MESSENGERS, are apparently theological ambassadors or missionaries (See 2 Corinth. v. 20. Ephes. vi. 20.); the most natural *presumption* at least is, that these Papyrine Books are the Holy Scriptures.

[1] 1 Corinth. xi. 10.

power on her head because of the MESSENGERS: that is to say, as the general drift of the whole passage abundantly shews, she, though an inspired MESSENGER herself, ought humbly, instead of being inflated with unbecoming pride, to have her head covered as an acknowledgment of her natural inferiority to the inspired MESSENGERS of the other sex.

Again we read, that *there was given to* the great apostle of the Gentiles *a thorn in the flesh, a* MESSENGER *of Satan, to buffet him*[1]. The original word, here rightly translated *a* MESSENGER, might however have been equally translated *an* ANGEL so far as the mere letter is concerned: but the authors of our English version, as if conscious that such a rendering might give countenance to some idle tale that St. Paul was sensibly assaulted by an evil spirit, judiciously explain the term to mean only *a* MESSENGER. Yet still the question remains, Who or what is this MESSENGER of Satan? Many have been the speculations, which the subject has occasioned: but here again the difficulty admits of a sufficiently easy solution. St. Paul had been honoured by communications with God of a much higher nature than was usually the case with other inspired ministers: insomuch, that, *whether in the body or out of the body, he had been caught up to the third heaven into Paradise,* where

[1] 2 Corinth. xii. 7.

he had *heard unspeakable words which it is not lawful for a man to utter.* Now he tells us, that, *lest he should be exalted above measure through the abundance of these revelations* by which he was so eminently accredited as a MESSENGER of God, *there was given to him a thorn in the flesh, a* MESSENGER *of Satan, to buffet him, lest he should be exalted above measure.* The circumstance was permitted then, specially lest he should think too highly of himself as an inspired MESSENGER of the Lord: and the mode, in which any tendency to a dangerous self-sufficiency was to be counteracted, was by God's allowing a certain MESSENGER of Satan to give him as much trouble as a thorn in the flesh would give him pain. But what could answer the purposed end more completely, than to suffer a false teacher to start up and pertinaciously to counteract the apostolic labours of this eminently endowed true teacher? For what could tend more to keep the faithful minister in a humble frame of soul, than to perceive various fickle and light-minded individuals, who had been brought through his preaching to the knowledge of the sincere Gospel, now forsaking their spiritual father and running with itching ears after a specious hypocritical impostor; while the schismatical demagogue himself probably affected to undervalue the gifts of the painful apostle, and even took occasion to ridicule him on account of some defect or infirmity in his bodily presence? I am

inclined then to think, both from the general context of the passage, and from the very expression *a* MESSENGER *of Satan* viewed as employed contradistinctively to *a* MESSENGER *of God*, that the person thus stigmatized was one of those false teachers, respecting whom we hear such frequent complaints throughout the various apostolic epistles. To this opinion I am the more led by the language, which St. Paul uses in the very letter, that speaks of his being buffeted by a MESSENGER of Satan. *I am jealous over you*, says he to the Corinthians, *with a godly jealousy: for I have espoused you to one husband, that I may present you as a chaste virgin to Christ. But I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ. For, if he that cometh preacheth another Jesus whom we have not preached, or if ye receive another spirit which ye have not received or another gospel which ye have not accepted, ye might well bear with it: for I suppose I was not a whit behind the very chiefest apostles. But, what I do, that I will do, that I may cut off occasion from them which desire occasion, that wherein they glory they may be found even as we. For such are false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ. And no marvel; for Satan himself is transformed into an* ANGEL *(or* MESSENGER*) of light. Therefore it is no great thing, if his ministers also be transformed as the ministers of*

righteousness: whose end shall be according to their works[1]. This passage seems to me the best possible comment on the other. From it we learn, that St. Paul had actually in the Church of Corinth certain opponents, who preached the early paganizing heresy of a Christ different from him whom the apostle preached[2]: and we find him declaring them to be ministers of Satan, who, like their master, could assume the appearance of a minister of righteousness or a divinely commissioned MESSENGER of light. Consequently, when the two passages are compared together, we seem almost obliged to conclude, that the MESSENGER of Satan, who was to him as a thorn in the flesh, was the chief or ringleader of those diabolical agents, who sought to corrupt the Corinthians from the simplicity that is in Christ as the primeval serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty.

So likewise we read in the Apocalypse of there being *war in heaven: Michael and his* ANGELS *fought against the dragon; and the dragon fought and his* ANGELS: *and they prevailed not, neither was their place found any more in heaven*[3]. Here the CHIEF MESSENGER Michael is exhibited in the very same state of opposition to the infernal dragon, that Christ the GREAT MESSEN-

[1] 2 Corinth. xi. 2—5, 12—15.

[2] See Horæ Mosaic. book ii. sect ii. chap. 2.

[3] Rev. xii. 7, 8.

GER of the covenant is to the devil. The stage, on which is played the mighty game of their spiritual warfare, is heaven: and each fights at the head of his own subordinate ANGELS or MESSENGERS. Now, in the figured language of prophecy, *heaven*, when understood *spiritually* as opposed to *secularly*, imports *the dominant Church general:* consequently, the battle is won, not in the literal heaven by celestial agents, but on earth by merely mortal champions; Christ and Satan each taking his part solely as invisible leaders. Accordingly it is said of the warriors of Michael, that *they overcame the dragon by the blood of the Lamb and by the word of their testimony; and* THEY LOVED NOT THEIR LIVES UNTO THE DEATH [1]. Hence it is evident, that, as the ANGELS of Michael proved victorious *by sealing the truth with their blood,* they could not possibly be created *unembodied* glorious spirits: and hence, as we must needs infer by analogy, the ANGELS of the dragon, who violently persecuted them to death, could not possibly be created *unembodied* fallen spirits. Each were plainly MEN: and, as they are alike denominated ANGELS OR MESSENGERS, they must have been men supporting similar characters though really under totally different masters. Such, as it appears to me, must be the general abstract interpretation of the passage, whatever may be

[1] Rev. xii. 11.

its particular application. There cannot, I think, be a doubt, that the contending ANGELS are mere men, who equally sustain the sacred office of MESSENGERS: though some are indeed, as Malachi speaks, *the* MESSENGERS *of the Lord of hosts;* while others, whatever may be their pretensions, are truly, in the language of St. Paul, MESSENGERS *of Satan*[1].

[1] Malach. ii. 7. 2 Corinth. xii. 7. I am inclined to think, that this view of the matter may serve to explain the grounds, on which the lxx have given a very extraordinary translation or rather paraphrase of a text in Deuteronomy. The literal rendering of the original Hebrew is; *When the Most High divided to the nations their inheritance, when he separated the sons of Adam, he set the bounds of the peoples with reference to the number of the children of Israel.* Deut. xxxii. 8. Such is the literal translation of the passage: but, instead of writing *the children of Israel,* the lxx paraphrastically write *the angels of God.* This singular discrepance has often occasioned no small speculation; and some authors have even fancifully employed it as an argument to establish the doctrine, that each people has a presiding guardian angel: but, if I mistake not, we must seek for the true key in the official character of the Israelites, as contradistinguished from the idolatrously apostate Gentiles. Now their official character is given by the Lord himself in the following words. *If ye will obey my voice indeed and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people; for all the earth is mine: and ye shall be unto me* A KINGDOM OF PRIESTS AND A HOLY NATION. Exod. xix. 5, 6. *A kingdom of priests* however is, in the language of Malachi, *a kingdom of the angels or messengers of God.* Hence, when the lxx wrote, *According to the number of the angels of God;* they did but paraphrastically express the sense of the original

2. We have now gone very far to establish the character of the depraved ANGELS mentioned by St. Peter and St. Jude: for we have ascertained *negatively*, that they are not fallen unembodied spirits; and we have ascertained *positively*, first that they are mere MEN, and secondly (so far as we can analogically determine from the meaning of the words MALACH and ANGELUS, when they are applied to men) that they are certain apostate MESSENGERS or impious sacerdotal ministers of the Lord. It only therefore remains for us to inquire, what *particular* MESSENGERS are intended by them.

(1.) The character given of them by St. Jude, as it runs in our common English version, is,

Hebrew, *According to the number of the children of Israel*, because the children of Israel were a kingdom of priests. This character of the ancient Israelites St. Peter no doubt had in his eye, when he similarly styles those spiritual believers, who constitute the mystic body of Christ, A CHOSEN GENERATION, A ROYAL PRIESTHOOD, A HOLY NATION, A PECULIAR PEOPLE. 1 Pet. ii. 9. With equal propriety, and on the same principles, we might denominate them THE ANGELS OF GOD. I more than suspect, that those ANGELS, whose office it will be to gather together the elect of Christ from the four winds with a great sound of a trumpet, at the close of the times of the Gentiles and of the long tribulation of the Jews, are no unembodied spirits but mere human missionaries or messengers, who in the last age will blow the figurative trumpet of the Gospel and who will successfully evangelize the whole world. Compare Matt. xxiv. 29—31. with Isaiah xviii. 2, 3. and xi. 9—13.

that they *kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation.*

Doubtful however, whether *their first estate* was the best possible rendering of the original Greek, our translators have placed in the margin another sense, namely *their principality:* so that, according to this exposition, the MESSENGERS are described as persons who *kept not their principality;* by which I see not what we can understand except some kind of *sacerdotal empire,* that had been previously exercised by them.

Such an exposition, I am fully persuaded, is the right one: and my reasons for adopting it, in preference to the other, will very shortly appear. The ANGELS therefore under discussion were certain MESSENGERS or priests of God; who kept not their primitive sacerdotal empire, but who spontaneously relinquished it and who left in consequence their own fixed and proper habitation.

This is the historical fact recorded of them: and the fact evidently constituted their unpardonable impiety; for no other ground is assigned for their punishment, save this very abandonment of the priesthood and this very emigration from the territory of their brethren in office. *The* MESSENGERS *which kept not their principality but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment*

of the great day. It appears indeed afterward from St. Jude's comparison, that they fell into all the complicated abominations of Sodom and Gomorrha: but still their lamentable fall into these abominations is plainly *the consequence* of their previous abdication and emigration. Hence it is impossible to view their abdication and emigration in any other light, than that of a formal and determined apostasy from the service of the living God to the polluted society and nefarious practices of certain abandoned contemporaries, who inhabited some region altogether distinct from that country which they had quitted. Nor was even this the whole of their impiety: for this, bad as it was, might, through the infinite mercy of God, have been pardoned on their sincere repentance and amendment. We may gather not equivocally, that they added to the worst profligacy of manners the crowning spiritual sin of avowed infidelity. This I infer, from their being placed in the same class with Cain, who rejected the doctrine of *the atonement;* with the antediluvians, who disregarded the prophetic warnings of Noah, and who are compared by our Lord to that *faithless* generation which he will find upon earth in the day of his second advent; and above all with those numerous antichrists, whether contemporary with the apostles or destined to spring up in the last days, whose leading characteristic, THE VERY SPIRIT OF ANTICHRIST as St. John

speaks, is stated to be A DENIAL OF THE ONLY LORD GOD AND OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST.

(2.) A whole body of God's MESSENGERS, thus awfully and peculiarly distinguished, cannot, it is to be hoped, very often appear upon the face of the earth. We have indeed witnessed an event of this description in our own evil days of rankly pullulating heresy and blasphemy[1]: but still the mere circumstance of the rareness, to say nothing of the evident magnitude, of so strange an occurrence may naturally be expected to assist us in ascertaining what persons are intended by them. Both St. Jude and St. Peter familiarly speak of the matter, as a thing well known: and since the latter certainly writes to the Jews who were scattered throughout the lesser Asia, and since the former from the style of his epistle very probably writes to the same persons; the history, in which we must seek for the event alluded to, can only be the ancient history contained in the Bible. The fact may indeed be darkly hinted at in the legends of the Gentiles: but, as the whole af-

[1] On the seventh of November 1793, Gobet, the republican bishop of Paris, with his grand vicars and others of his clergy, entered the hall of the national convention, solemnly resigned his functions, and abjured Christianity. At the same time, several protestant ecclesiastics also renounced the religion which their fathers had sealed with their own blood, and openly proclaimed their apostatic adhesion to the grand lye of Antichrist.

fair relates to a grand open defection of certain sacerdotal MESSENGERS of Jehovah, we cannot expect to find an authentic account of it any where save in Scripture.

Now we can find nothing like such a transaction in the whole history of the Israelites: for, though the people continually lapsed into idolatry and its characteristic vices, the priests and levites seem for the most part to have kept themselves tolerably clear, and were in effect the instrument in God's hands of preserving the kingdom of Judah in a much better state than that of the ten tribes; at any rate, they never deliberately apostatised in a body or emigrated from the land of Canaan. As little can we discover any such transaction in the account which we have of the early postdiluvians down to the time, when the history of Israel commences. A great apostasy from pure religion took place indeed at Babel: but this was no way *peculiar* to any patriarchal priesthood, which might then have existed. All mankind were equally concerned in the defection: and, bad as it was, it was still no defection to proper and absolute infidelity. The postdiluvian Gentiles rejected not the primeval doctrine of *the atonement:* on the contrary, at every period and in every part of the world, they zealously adhered to the ancient divinely-ordained rite of piacular sacrifice; insomuch that their early theological sys-

tem has been well styled by Epiphanius *a heresy* rather than a completely original invention, for it was in truth no other than Patriarchism disguised and corrupted and perverted [1]. Neither was there any *special* emigration of the priests. They doubtless left Ararat, when they rambled into the land of Shinar; and again they left the land of Shinar, at the time of the general dispersion: but, in doing this, they did nothing more than what all mankind did; nor can they upon either occasion be said to have left *their own peculiar habitation*, for Ararat and Shinar were severally no more *their* habitation than the habitation of *every* child of Noah.

If then we can meet with no transaction *after* the deluge, which bears the least resemblance to that specified by St. Jude; our only remaining hope is, that we may find it detailed as occurring *before* the deluge: and I am inclined to think, that in this hope we shall not be disappointed.

(3.) The first-born of Adam and Eve was Cain; whence, according to the old patriarchal arrangement which was not set aside until the house of Levi was called to minister before the Lord, Cain and his posterity after him would have swayed the sceptre of the regal priesthood among the children of his younger brothers; for,

[1] See Origin of Pagan Idol. book vi. chap. 6. § I. 1.

of old, the king and the priest were united in the same person[1]. But Cain forfeited his holy birthright by the foul crime of fratricide; and, Abel dying without issue, none of his seed could stand up in the room of their father. The birthright therefore devolved to the third son of Adam: and accordingly, when Eve bare him, *she called his name Seth; for God, said she, hath appointed me another seed instead of Abel whom Cain slew.*

Seth then and his posterity would constitute the royal priesthood of antediluvian Patriarchism; the male line in the eldest branch successively presiding as kings and high-priests, while the several members of the younger branches would subordinately share in the princely sacerdotal dignity: so that the whole would exhibit a hierarchy, after the model of which the Levitical hierarchy seems very evidently to have been framed.

The laity, for whose benefit and religious instruction this patriarchal hierarchy was ordained of God, comprized the descendants of those numerous sons and daughters, whom Adam is said to have begotten after Seth. These, with

[1] See Horæ Mosaic, book ii. sect. i. chap. 1. § VII. 1. (3.) and Selden. de success. in Pontif. Heb. lib. i. c. 1. The pagans, down even to a very late period, had by no means lost all recollection of this ancient arrangement, as appears from the well known verse of the Latin poet; *Rex Anius, rex idem hominum Phœbique sacerdos.*

their royal priesthood at their head, long formed a single community: and, according to the general voice of oriental antiquity, the line of regal patriarchs from Seth to Noah never ceased to dwell in the immediate vicinity of the holy Paradisiacal mount of God, until an incorrigible race was swept away by the waters of the deluge [1].

That such was actually the case, may be gathered, I think, not obscurely from the history of Cain.

We have seen, that the original promise of the woman's Seed was delivered in no unintelligible manner to our first parents; but that the doctrine of *an atonement, to be effected by the bloody death of a divine Saviour, and to be typically shadowed out by the piacular sacrifice of bestial victims,* was revealed with sufficient clearness to be a ground both of faith and of hope [2]. Now Cain, like many of his copyists under the Christian Dispensation, rejected with contempt the humiliating doctrine, on which rests the necessity of a Redeemer: and, rejecting the doctrine, he of course rejected the typical rite of bloody sacrifice as palpably superfluous and absurd. Abel, on the other hand, faithfully receiving the doctrine, obediently adhered to the pre-

[1] Syncell. Chronog. p. 10. Eutych. Annal. vol. i. p. 19, 36. apud Fabric. Pseudepig. vol. i.

[2] See above book i. chap. 5. § II. and Horæ Mosaic. book ii. sect i. chap. 2. § I. 1.

scribed shadowy ordinance. Hence his sacrifice was accepted: while that of Cain, consisting only of the bloodless fruits of the earth, systematically excluding the idea of an atonement, and thus being offered up in the very spirit of self-righteous infidelity, was rejected of God as utterly abominable. This public testimony against his unhallowed speculations, instead of moving the first-born humbly to retract them, served only to provoke him to unutterable wrath. Yet, even while he was in this impious frame of mind, a merciful God condescended to reason with him and distinctly to point out the ground on which his sacrifice had been rejected. Cain however was immovable: he persevered in his own opinion; he maintained his own righteousness; and the earliest fruit of that morality, which boasted itself to require not any atonement, was a stubborn opposition to God and the murder of an unoffending brother[1]. In this diabolical temper, *he went out*, we are told, *from before the presence of the Lord, and dwelt in a land of wanderings on the east of Eden*[2]. But, if he thus went out to the east of Eden, he must previously have dwelt in the region of Eden: and, if *he* previously dwelt in the region of Eden, that same country must evidently have been the

[1] See Horæ Mosaic. book ii. sect. iii. chap. 2. § I. 1, 2. and Origin of Pagan Idol. book ii. chap. 8. § II. 4.

[2] Gen. iv. 16.

habitation both of Adam and of Abel. Indeed common sense itself may teach us, that, on every account, our first parents would not depart far from their native Paradise. Yet this is not the whole that is said of Cain's emigration: he not only went out from Eden, but he likewise *went out from before the presence of Jehovah.* The presence therefore of Jehovah was manifested in the region of Eden: and, when we recollect the way in which it was manifested at a subsequent period in the Levitical tabernacle, we can scarcely doubt, that it was there also permanently revealed between the Cherubim at the eastern gate of Paradise[1]. This was the metropolitan church then, as it were, of antediluvian Patriarchism; closely corresponding with its transcripts in a later age, the successive tabernacle and temple of the Israelites. Here, consequently, would preside the royal high-priest of the line of Seth: and round the mount of Paradise, to which the flaming Cherubim now barred all access, would naturally and regularly be arranged the collegiate habitations of his younger sacerdotal brethren and assessors; while, in still widening circles, the laic posterity of Adam's younger children would harmoniously fix their residence. But, from the divine presence at the gate of Paradise, the excom-

[1] See Hore Mosaic. book ii. sect. i. chap. 1. § VII. 1. (7.) and Origin of Pagan Idol. book ii. chap. 6. § V. book vi. chap. 6. § I. 1.

municated and banished infidel Cain for ever departed. He went forth into a land of wanderings, agreeably to the curse of God: and here he became the parent of a community, altogether distinct and separate from that which was jointly formed round the mount of God by the other descendants of Adam.

(4.) From the obstinacy, with which Cain adhered to his infidel principles, we may be sure that his children, who constituted this separate community, would be duly trained up in his own favourite speculations.

Hence they would be taught to deny or at least to palliate, the corruption of human nature: they would be instructed to renounce and to ridicule, as plainly absurd and unnecessary, the doctrine of *the atonement:* their sacrifices, like that of their ancestor, would be merely eucharistic and systematically bloodless: and they would scoff at the fond expectation entertained by the other community, that *one of woman born would in due time bruise the head of the serpent though it should bruise his heel,* as the dream of ignorant fanaticism inculcated by a venal and tyrannical priesthood.

Nor would the matter stop with his immediate descendants or even with his own speculative principles. Since error is rarely stationary; and since they, who with a high hand depart from God, are often judicially given up to delusion so that they should devoutly believe their

own lye: we might anticipate without the gift of prophecy, that a community like this would rapidly advance from bad to worse; that, having commenced in the very face of Jehovah himself with rejecting the atonement, they would soon proceed to speculate presumptuously on the nature of the Supreme Being; and that thus, instead of even worshipping the true Divinity though with rites abominable in his eyes, they would progressively frame for themselves, as the Rabbins suppose them to have done, wild systems of atheistic Materialism, and would thence adore the several parts of the natural Universe as the varied members or forms of the great unknown Pantheus[1]. At all events, with error in doctrine, we know from Holy Scripture, that they united the most lawless violence and the most unbridled profligacy of manners. During the period which immediately preceded the deluge, *the earth was corrupt before God, and the earth was filled with violence*[2]: and, whether we be absolutely warranted or not in supposing the word, which our translators have rendered *giants*, really to mean *apostates*; we both are taught that *the imagination of the thoughts of man's heart was only evil continually*, and we are specially informed that the workings of this evil imagina-

[1] See Maimon. de Idolol. and Sanchon. apud Euseb. Præp. Evan. lib. i. c. 10.

[2] Gen. vi. 11.

tion shewed themselves in a rejection of God and in a denial that the Almighty could do aught for his faithful servants [1].

(5.) The foregoing statement would exhibit the early antediluvian world, as divided into two grand communities radically differing from each other both in principle and in practice: it would exhibit it, in short, as divided into the two parties of believers and unbelievers.

Such I take to have been its condition for some centuries: but man is prone to evil; and the well-instructed are much more inclined to degenerate, than the ill-instructed are to be reclaimed. If, agreeably both to oriental tradition and to the peculiar language of Scripture respecting the emigration of Cain, we suppose the regally sacerdotal house of Seth to have permanently established itself round the holy mount of Paradise; while the descendants of Adam's younger children circularly dwelt round the habitation of their priestly sovereigns: it seems probable, from the nature of the curse of Cain, that, in process of time, his unsettled children would form a yet larger circle round

[1] Gen. vi. 4, 5. Job xxii. 15, 16, 17. This last passage is a very remarkable one, because it throws a strong light upon the nature of antediluvian apostasy. *Hast thou marked the old way, which wicked men have trodden? Which were cut down out of time, whose foundation was overflowed with the flood: which said unto God; Depart from us, and what can the Almighty do for them?*

the territories of the believing community. For, as Cain was doomed to be a wanderer himself notwithstanding he is said to have built a town, his roving habits would naturally be communicated to great numbers of his posterity: whence a large portion of the Cainites would obviously be in a nomade state, not unlike that of the old Scythians or the modern Tartars. Accordingly, though to some of that house arts are ascribed which imply a certain degree of local fixedness; others are represented, as erratically dwelling in tents and as being shepherds or herdsmen[1]. This circumstance would at once lead to extensive and rambling colonization; and would gradually train up a hardy and unprincipled race to deeds of rapine and violence and bloodshed, such as characterized the world in the period immediately before the deluge: for the idle fancy of poets alone has decorated shepherds and herdsmen with the refined softness of imaginary Arcadian manners; history proves, that their erratic condition has rather led them in all ages to be fierce and lawless warriors.

It might perhaps be thought, that the numbers of the Cainites would be so much inferior to those of the other Adamitical families united, that the infidel community could never thus widely extend itself round the territories of the

[1] Gen. iv. 19—22.

believing community: but we labour under a deception, if we do not estimate the single house of Cain to be fully equal in population to all the other houses conjointly. Cain was certainly an adult and very probably the father of a family, when his brother Seth was born; and Seth was the oldest of all the remaining sons of Adam. In point of increase therefore, Cain stands on the same step with his father Adam: and all the other children of Adam rank coëtaneously, not with Cain, but with the children of Cain. Hence the two great antediluvian houses are really just as much the two houses of Adam and Cain, as if Adam and Cain had been coëtaneous brethren: and, since many of the children of Cain were probably born *before* Seth and the younger children of Adam; the family of Cain, in progressive increase, might even have had the start of the family of Adam.

(6.) The house of Cain thus daily coming more and more in contact with the house of Adam, the faithful community would be more and more exposed to the contagion of evil example: for the borderers would now have a perpetual intercourse with each other.

Accordingly it is said in Scripture, that wickedness rapidly increased, when *men began to multiply upon the face of the earth*[1]. Josephus asserts, that righteousness prevailed in the line

[1] Gen. vi. 1.

of Seth for seven generations, and that then at length they lapsed into the impiety of their neighbours[1]. In this assertion, he is borne out by a calculation, which may easily be made from the antediluvian genealogical numbers: and indeed the very reason of the thing seems to require our belief; for, on account both of their sacerdotal character and of their centrical situation round the holy mount, the children of Seth would be the last that were corrupted. The progress of evil would be from the circumference to the centre. First, the extreme borderers would be drawn into apostasy by a frequent mixture with the now rapidly approximating Cainites. From them the wasting mischief would creep into the interior, until the whole body of the laity with such of the priests as might be scattered among them was thoroughly infected with the poison. Last of all, it would approach the peculiar collegiate habitations of the sacerdotal princes.

(7.) And now, following the stream of antediluvian history, we are brought, if I mistake not, to the awful event, which is mentioned by St. Jude and St. Peter. The circumstance, with all its baneful consequences, is thus detailed by Moses.

It came to pass, when men began to multiply on the face of the earth and daughters were born unto

[1] Joseph. Ant. Jud. lib. i. c. 3.

them, that THE SONS OF GOD *saw the daughters of men that they were fair; and they took them wives of all which they chose. And the Lord said, My Spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh: yet his days shall be an hundred and twenty years. There were giants in the earth in those days: and also, after that when* THE SONS OF GOD *came in unto the daughters of men, and they bare children to them; the same became mighty men which were of old, men of renown. And God saw, that the wickedness of man was great upon the earth; and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually. And it repented the Lord, that he had made man on the earth, and it grieved him at his heart. The earth also was corrupt before God; and the earth was filled with violence. And God looked upon the earth; and, behold, it was corrupt: for all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth*[1].

From this narrative it appears, that, an hundred and twenty years before the deluge, which was the time allotted for the preaching of Noah, and consequently (as Josephus rightly states) after the translation of Enoch the seventh from Adam and during the time that Methuselah and the eighth generation were flourishing, certain persons denominated THE SONS OF GOD, took wives to themselves from among the daughters

[1] Gen. vi. 1—6, 11, 12.

of men[1]. The circumstance occurred during a period of very prevalent wickedness: for there were already giants or lawless conquerors or (as some understand the word to mean) apostates in the world, and the impiety of man was already great upon the earth. Hence the marriages of these SONS OF GOD were not *the primary cause* of the general corruption: they were rather *a falling in* with the strong current of the times. The persons thus designated, continually associating with men all whose speculative imaginations were only evil, were seduced at length into their way of thinking, and were thence naturally led to form matrimonial alliances with them. In forming such misalliances with the wicked, they incurred the very guilt, against which in after ages the Israelites were so strictly cautioned: and I am inclined to think, that the caution was given to the people of God, not only from the moral fitness of the precept, but likewise in express reference to the lamentable

[1] The marriages of the sons of God with the daughters of men began to take place 120 years before the deluge. But Enoch, the governing patriarch of the seventh generation, was translated 669 years before that event: and his son Methuselah, the governing patriarch of the eighth generation, was born 969 years previous to the flood, and died in the very year of its occurrence; Lamech, his son, having died 5 years before him. Hence it is evident, that these unlawful marriages occurred, *after* the seventh, and *in the course of* the eighth, generation.

error of these once righteous antediluvians. The evil had actually been felt in the Church: and a wise lawgiver sought to guard against its recurrence. Of these marriages the fruits were men of a similar character to the Cainite giants: they were *mighty men which were of old, men of renown.* Ceasing to rank with their pious ancestors as THE SONS OF GOD, they mingled with their wicked relatives on the maternal side, imbibed all their opinions, and adopted all their practices.

After this defection, impiety advanced with accelerated strides: the preaching of Noah was as ineffectual, in the case of the apostates; as the testimony of Enoch had been at an earlier stage of the malady, ere the sons of God had intermarried with the daughters of men, and while the laity alone were infected by the poison of Cainite infidelity: and at length, when the righteous Lamech had been taken away by the hand of death from the evil to come, and when the allotted hundred and twenty years drew near to their termination, so universal had been the spread of corruption, that a single family alone was found to be untainted. This was the family of the reigning sacerdotal king, the ninth in descent by regular primogeniture from Seth, to whom appertained the patriarchal birth-right. The Church, under his archiepiscopal controul, had lapsed into general infidelity: priesthood and laity were alike become abominable; but

still, even in those lawless times, his authority as a temporal sovereign, through the overruling providence of God, was not altogether disowned. Some were disposed to obey him, as a prince; though they despised his admonitions, and ridiculed his humble piety, as a priest. Had not this been the case, it were impossible for him to have constructed the ark and to have collected the necessary stores and animals for its lading. A work of such gigantic magnitude required the united labour of multitudes, and was plainly far beyond the feeble exertions of a single family. Hence the madness of man was overruled by the controuling wisdom of God: and numbers, at the behest of their sovereign, toiled to complete the mighty vessel, from which they themselves stood excluded through their own wickedness and unbelief.

(8.) It will readily be anticipated, that I would identify the SONS OF GOD spoken of by Moses with the fallen ANGELS or MESSENGERS who are mentioned by St. Jude and St. Peter. To this arrangement I am led by their exact mutual correspondence in every particular.

The MESSENGERS are adduced in close connection with various other examples, sought out of the most remote antiquity; such as the antediluvians in the time of Noah, the depraved inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrha, and the unbelieving Israelites in the wilderness: whence we may infer, that *they* also are no compara-

tively modern transgressors, but that they belong to a very distant period. Now this is precisely the case with the SONS OF GOD.

Again: from the circumstance of their being charged with *corporeal* abominations of which *spirits* are physically incapable, the MESSENGERS have been demonstrated to be mortal men, and not unembodied spirits: and, from the perpetual usage of the terms MALACH and ANGELUS by the inspired writers of the Old and New Testaments, they have been further proved to be sacerdotal ministers of Jehovah. Such also is plainly enough the character of the SONS OF GOD: they are mortal men, or they could not have contracted unlawful marriages; they are priests or prophets of God, because they are placed in studied contradistinction to men in general, and because the very title of A SON OF GOD is both analogous to that of A MAN OF GOD and is expressly applied to every Christian as a member of what St. Peter calls (in allusion to Christ's sacerdotal empire whether under Patriarchism or under the Law) *a holy priesthood* and *a royal priesthood* [1].

The MESSENGERS are further said to have *kept not their principality;* or, in other words, to have abdicated, through apostasy, their princely dignities in the sacerdotal empire. In a similar

[1] John i. 12. Rom. viii. 14. Gal. iii. 26. 1 Peter ii. 5, 9.

manner, the SONS OF GOD joined themselves, by matrimonial connections, to the unbelieving Cainites; plunged into all their wickedness, both spiritual and corporeal; became the parents of a lawless and violent race; and so completely apostatised from the holiness of their station, that the religious system, propounded to Adam and handed down to posterity by Seth, a system expressly built upon the fall of man and his consequent need of an atoning mediator, was at length confined within the narrow limits of the high-priest's family.

Lastly, the MESSENGERS are said to have *left their own habitation*: that is to say, they emigrated in a body from the peculiar region which was allotted to their family; and, laying aside their sacerdotal distinction, they *sinned* by mingling with the heathen and by learning their ways. That such also was the conduct of the SONS OF GOD, may be inferred even from the brief narrative which Moses has given us of their transactions: for, to have taken wives from among the Cainites, they must have quitted the peaceful and hallowed abodes of their forefathers; and so little would they feel at ease in their pristine seats, that the blandishments of their wives would without much difficulty lead them to seek for habitations and society more suitable to their vitiated propensities, than the awful neighbourhood of Jehovah

enthroned between the blazing Cherubim, and the godly converse of that *just man* their forsaken prince and prelate.

III. On this view of a very curious subject a strong light is thrown by the narrative of Josephus, the great historian of the Jews.

I have already shewn, that Adam and Eve, when driven out of Paradise, still continued to inhabit the land of Eden: for they were plainly there at the time of Abel's murder, because Cain is said to have gone forth *eastward* FROM *Eden* into the country of his wanderings; whence Eden must previously have been his residence.

Now Josephus tells us, that Seth, being an eminently pious man, left behind him many sons imitators of his holiness: all of whom, being truly religious persons, continued to live, from generation to generation, IN THE SAME LAND without ever being compelled to emigrate. Here, during seven genealogical descents, they devoted their learned leisure, in a sort of collegiate state, to the elevating study of astronomy: while, in regard to doctrine and practice, they believed God to be the Lord of the Universe, and laboured in all things to promote the cause of virtue and religion. As for their government, it was a patriarchal monarchy, descending from father to son in the male line of the eldest branch: and this peculiar monarchy Josephus designates by the identical Greek name, which St. Jude uses to describe the PRINCIPALITY that was

abdicated by the apostate messengers[1]. Seth delivered his patriarchal sceptre to Enos: Enos handed down to Cainan the regal administration of public affairs. To him succeeded Mahalaleel and Jared and Enoch. Next came Methuselah; who, to adopt the phraseology of Josephus, delivered up the PRINCIPALITY to Lamech: and Lamech, after having long held this same PRINCIPALITY, was succeeded by Noah as the sovereign administrator of the empire[2]. In the princely house of Seth then holiness prevailed during seven generations, or until the contemporaries of Enoch had been swept away by the hand of death: but, about an hundred and twenty years before the flood (as Moses informs us), a lamentable change began to take place in this hitherto righteous family. The members of it, at that time, degenerated from the institutes of their forefathers; neither rendering to God

[1] Gr. *την αρχην*.

[2] I take it, that, in this antediluvian succession of princes, the sovereignty was not held until death, but was abdicated when the reigning monarch became inactive and incapable through old age. On any other supposition, the reign of Adam must have been extended to a most disproportionate length: and Lamech, who died before his father, would never have come to the throne at all. This does not seem to have been considered by Josephus, when he somewhat carelessly observes, that Methuselah delivered the principality to Lamech, after he had held it 969 years; and that Lamech, after a reign of 777 years, similarly delivered it to Noah. These terms are the years of each patriarch's *life*, not of his *reign*.

his due worship, nor regarding the exercise of justice towards man: so that, as the best things when corrupted proverbially become the worst, the zeal, which they had hitherto displayed in the cause of virtue, was now manifested with double energy in the cause of vice. On this account, they stirred up against themselves the righteous indignation of heaven: FOR many persons, whom Josephus styles ANGELS OR MESSENGERS *of God*, connecting themselves with the women of that age, begat a lawless race, who through a vain confidence in their strength despised every thing that was good [1].

1. It is easy to perceive, that the narrative of Josephus, borrowed no doubt, where any particulars are added to the scriptural history, from the old national traditions of Israel, coincides very singularly with the deductions which I have been led to form independently of it.

The family of Seth are declared to have lived permanently IN THE SAME LAND, from the days of their ancestor down even to the time of the flood: which land we may collect from Scripture to be THE LAND OF EDEN, in the immediate neighbourhood of the holy Paradisiacal mountain. Here they are described as exercising a regal authority; the PRINCIPALITY, as Josephus like St. Jude denominates their imperial sovereignty, being regularly transmitted

[1] Joseph. Ant. Jud. lib. i. c. 2. § 3. c. 3. § 1, 4.

from father to son in the eldest line, until at length it was vested in the person of Noah[1]. But with this regal authority, according to the established maxims of Patriarchism, must have been associated the pontificate: and, agreeably to such a view of the matter, we find Enoch represented as a prophet and Noah declared to have been a preacher of righteousness[2]. At length the once holy Sethites degenerated, slighting the worship of the true God and acting unjustly toward man: and the special reason which the historian gives, WHY the wrath of heaven was stirred up against them, is the unlawful intermarriage of certain ANGELS or MESSENGERS of God with women of corrupt principles[3].

That these ANGELS are the same persons as those whom Moses denominates THE SONS OF GOD, is perfectly clear: the only question therefore is, *what* persons are intended by them.

Some have not slightly censured the Jewish historian, on the ground that he has introduced an absurd Rabbinical story respecting a cohabi-

[1] Almost every ancient pagan tradition of the deluge makes the person saved in the ship to have previously been a sovereign prince. This was alike the case with the Babylonic Xisuthrus, the Indian Menu, the Greek and Scythian Deucalion, and the Celtic Hu.

[2] Jude 14. 2 Peter ii. 5.

[3] Ενθεν ἑαυτοις τον Θεον εξεπολεμωσαν· πολλοι ΓΑΡ αγγελοι Θεου, γυναιξι συμμιγεντες, ὑβριστας εγεννησαν παιδας.

tation of fallen spirits with mortal women: and others, at an early period of the Christian Church, adopted the story in question with all its manifold absurdities upon its head[1]. But I see no reason, why Josephus should be saddled with such impertinences: the blame does not attach to *him*, but to those who have strangely misunderstood his language. Common sense itself might shew, that persons, who espouse women and become the parents of a numerous offspring, could not be unembodied spirits, but must be real substantial human beings: and the very language of the historian proves, that *he* too viewed them under this identical aspect. For why should the wrath of God be kindled against the Sethites, *on account of* unembodied spirits having commerce with mortal women? Had such a wonder been possible, or had it ever happened, *the Sethites* at all events would have been no way to blame. Yet are *they* represented by Josephus, as stirring up the enmity of God against themselves *by this very*

[1] Justin. Mart. Tertull. Athenag. Clem. Alex. Euseb. Lactan. Ambros. et alii apud Sixt. Senens. bibl. sacr. lib. v. annot, 77. Sulp. Sever. hist. sacr. lib. i. p. 8. Prophet. Enoch. apud Syncell. Chronog. p. 11, 12, 13, 24, 25, 26. Some of the Jewish interpreters are not far mistaken in supposing, that *the sons of God* mean *princes, great men, and magistrates:* they ought to have added *of the house of Seth.* See Anc. Univ. Hist. vol. i. p. 171—175. and Fabric. Pseudepig. vol. i. p. 179—198.

transaction. Hence it evidently follows, that he meant to describe these ANGELS, not only as *men*, but as *men of the house of Seth:* for, on no other supposition, will there be the least coherence or consistency in his statement; that *they moved God to enmity against themselves,* FOR *many angels of God having commerce with women became the parents of a lawless offspring.* Why then does he call the Sethites ANGELS *of God?* Clearly in the same sense that Moses calls them SONS *of God.* Josephus was perfectly aware, that MALACH in his own language, and that ANGELUS in Greek, simply and properly denote A MESSENGER: and he further well knew, that, throughout the Hebrew Scriptures and their Greek translation by the Seventy, these corresponding terms are used to describe, not unembodied spirits alone, but the sacerdotal or prophetic MESSENGERS of Jehovah whom he employs to convey his high behests to mankind. Hence very appropriately he applies the Greek word to the Sethites, in reference to their priestly character: for, as Malachi speaks, A PRIEST is the ANGEL or MESSENGER of the Lord of hosts[1]. Let the historian be thus understood, and all is plain and consistent: *the Sethites moved God to enmity against themselves;* FOR *many sacerdotal messengers of their house contracted unlawful marriages, which paved the way*

[1] Malach. ii. 7.

for every kind of iniquity. Josephus now speaks rationally and intelligibly: and an idle story, with the fabrication or at least with the approbation of which he has been unjustly charged, vanishes into empty air.

But, while this eminent writer is thus vindicated from a palpable absurdity; we cannot but observe, that he distinguishes the Sethites by the identical appellation which St. Jude and St. Peter bestow upon certain ancient transgressors, who, like the Sethites of old, kept not their principality, who left their own habitation, and whose sins resembled those of Sodom and Gomorrha. On the whole, I think it sufficiently clear, that the ANGELI of Josephus are the same persons as the ANGELI of the two Christian apostles.

2. The Jewish historian well remarks, that the children of these apostate messengers are reported to have performed the very deeds, which the Greeks ascribe to the giants or Titans: and he adds, that Noah, having long fruitlessly attempted to reform them, finally emigrated from the country through fear of their murdering both himself and his family [1].

Respecting this emigration of *the royal prelate,* I much doubt: both because St. Jude describes *the* MESSENGERS, as being the persons who left

[1] Joseph. Ant. Jud. lib. i. c. 3. § 1.

their own habitation; because the general voice of oriental antiquity is, that Noah remained in the neighbourhood of Paradise to the very commencement of the flood; and because he would with so much greater facility command hands to build the ark within his own immediate territories, than in a land of completely hostile strangers: but the other observations of Josephus involve much curious and interesting matter.

(1.) As the apostasy of the Sethite messengers did not take place until *after* the translation of Enoch; the ministry of that holy prince must have altogether respected the laity of his dominions, now rapidly corrupting themselves *in the way of Cain.* But the ministry of Noah seems to have had a different object: *he,* I take it, as the Jewish historian teaches us, chiefly laboured to reclaim his miserable apostatizing clergy and to prevent their brethren from following their example; the laity were too numerous, too remote, and too far gone in error, to afford any reasonable prospect of success.

To this St. Peter alludes, in a passage of somewhat difficult explication: though, when it is compared with what I suppose to be parallel passages, the true meaning may haply be elicited.

Christ is said to have *gone by the Holy Ghost and to have preached to the spirits that are in prison, which sometime were disobedient, when once the long-*

suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing[1].

Now, as our Lord preached to these characters *only* by the Spirit, and as they are declared to have been disobedient while the ark was building; we may be sure, that Noah was the *visible* messenger employed on this occasion. Noah then was the person; who, under the influence of the Holy Ghost, preached to the spirits that are in prison. At the time when he preached to them, they were of course embodied spirits; nor were they then in any place of confinement, but were living at large in the midst of their unhallowed enjoyments: but, at the period when St. Peter wrote of them, they had been long dead, and were therefore become disembodied spirits; hence he speaks of them, as *the spirits that are now in prison*[2]. Such is the peculiar description of these subjects of the Noëtic ministry: they are, at the present moment, *incarcerated spirits*.

Do we read however of any other beings similarly circumstanced? This same St. Peter tells us, that the ANGELS OF MESSENGERS, whose character we have been discussing, were *plunged in chains of darkness into hell, where they are reserved in safe custody unto judgment*[3]: And St.

[1] 1 Peter iii. 18, 19, 20.

[2] Gr. *τοις εν φυλακη πνευμασι.*

[3] 2 Peter ii. 4.

Jude similarly declares, that they *are reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day*[1].

The spirits therefore, to whom Christ preached by the visible agency of Noah while they were as yet in the flesh, are in the very same predicament as those ANGELS or MESSENGERS, who (it is trusted) have been satisfactorily identified with the apostate sacerdotal Sethites. Hence, I think, we may venture to conclude, that *the spirits now in prison* are the same persons as *the incarcerated messengers*. Consequently, *the spirits now in prison*, to whom Noah preached while in the flesh, are not *all the antediluvians collectively*, but only *the apostate priests of the house of Seth*.

With this conclusion accords the language of Moses. After stating, that *the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair*, and that *they took them wives of all which they chose:* he then introduces the Lord as saying, *My spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also*, even he the once faithful Sethite, *is flesh; yet his days shall be an hundred and twenty years*[2]. Here, the allowing a period of an hundred and twenty years for repentance, before the judicial catastrophè of the deluge, is plainly spoken of in immediate connection with the apostasy of the Sethite sons of God. On *their* account, consequently, the term was fixed: the laity had al-

[1] Jude 6. [2] Gen. vi. 2, 3.

ready sinned away their day of grace, in pertinaciously slighting the ministry of Enoch: but the hand of the Lord was stayed, because the iniquity of the sacerdotal Sethites was not yet full. To *them* it was that Noah was *a preacher of righteousness*, as Enoch had already been to the laity: and, accordingly, when at the close of the hundred and twenty years the whole clerical body was so corrupted that the family of the high-priest alone had preserved its integrity, a righteous, though long-enduring, God then *brought in the flood upon the world of the ungodly*[1].

[1] I am unable to follow Bishop Horsley in the view which he takes of this remarkable passage, 1 Peter iii. 18, 19, 20. The single word ζωοποιηθεις, even to say nothing of other objections, seems to me alone sufficient to render his whole exposition untenable. The learned prelate does indeed assert, what is absolutely necessary to his purpose, that ζωοποιηθεις may simply denote *quick* as well as *being quickened:* but from the derivation at least of this compound word, I am unable to comprehend how it can possibly bear any such meaning. Ζωοποιεω literally signifies *to make alive:* and *the act of quickening* or *making alive* specially belongs to the Holy Spirit; whence it is said of that blessed personage, το πνευμα εστι το ζωοποιον and Πνευμα ζωοποιει. John vi. 63. 2 Corinth. iii. 6. Through him the Father acts instrumentally, when he quickens, whether literally or mystically, both Christ the head and Christians the members: and, accordingly, to describe such quickening, the very same word is used as that which is here employed by St. Peter. See Coloss. ii. 13. Rom. viii. 11. Ephes. ii. 4—7. Hence, when the entire verse, wherein the participle ζωοποιηθεις occurs, is read in the

(2.) But Josephus observes, that the children of the messengers are reported to have done the very deeds, which the Greeks ascribe to the giants or Titans: and to his observation we may add from the Christian Scriptures, that they

original; I see not, how it can be translated differently from our common translation, or how the Spirit there mentioned can mean any other than the Πνευμα το ζωοποιον or the third person of the Blessed Trinity. Ὅτι καὶ Χριστος ἅπαξ περὶ ἁμαρτιων ἐπαθε, δικαιος ὑπερ ἀδικων ἵνα ἡμας προσαγαγῃ τῳ Θεῳ, θανατωθεις μεν σαρκι, ζωοποιηθεις δε τῳ πνευματι. *For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but* QUICKENED (or *made alive* or *restored to life) by the Spirit.* In fact, the sense of the passage is manifestly defective, if we exclude from it all mention of the resurrection: for Christ did not bring us to God simply by his death, but complexly by dying for our sins and by rising again as a prevailing intercessor for our justification. Rom. iv. 25. To this we may add, that, although the two substantives σαρκι and πνευματι are each written without any preposition (as Bishop Horsley very truly remarks); yet, that we are not to understand by πνευματι *the human soul of Christ* as by σαρκι we must doubtless understand *his human body*, is plainly (I think) evinced by the circumstance of the definite article τῳ being prefixed to πνευματι, while σαρκι has no article prefixed to it. But if πνευματι here mean *the Holy Spirit;* then *the preaching of Christ unto the spirits in prison* cannot mean *any personal preaching of Christ, during the interval between his death and his resurrection, to the spirits of the antediluvians confined in Sheol or Hades:* because the assertion, that he went and preached *in the Spirit*, excludes, by necessary implication, the idea that he went and preached *in person.* See Bishop Horsley's Serm. vol. ii. serm. 20.

are also represented as undergoing the very same incarceration in Tartarus.

Moses says only in general terms, that *they became mighty men, which were of old, men of renown;* that *every imagination of the thoughts of man's heart was only evil continually;* that *all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth;* and that *the earth was filled with violence:* but the pagan legends to which Josephus refers, and the traditions which have come down to the early Christian Church most probably through the medium of the Levitical Church, may throw some light upon the particular conduct of the apostate Sethites and their rebellious children.

In Gentile lore, the Titans or giants are described as being the offspring of Heaven and Earth: but, plunging into the most audacious wickedness, they madly dared to scale the very mount of God and to wage war against the high majesty of the Omnipotent. Their attempt however proved abortive: their ranks were broken by hot thunderbolts: and they were precipitated into the central Tartarus, where they lie bound with chains of brass in a dungeon of adamant. This event is placed by the old mythologists immediately before the deluge: and that we may not erroneously identify the rebel rout with Satan and his fallen associates as it has usually been the case with the apostate ANGELI of St. Peter and St. Jude, one of those writers styles the incarcerated Titans

the forefathers of our own race[1]. Accordingly, while the Titanic family is described as being generally impious and corrupt; eight of its members are declared to have been so eminently pious, that, after reigning upon earth benefactors to mankind and after sailing together in a wonderful ship over the boundless ocean, they were in succeeding ages venerated as the ancestors and principal hero-gods of the Gentiles[2].

Such are the tales of Paganism, to which Josephus alludes, when he says, that the children of the messengers are reported to have wrought the same deeds as the Hellenic Titans. But by whom are they thus reported of? Nothing very definite is said by Moses on the subject: consequently the persons, who thus speak of them, must have been the learned of the Hebrew Church that had carefully preserved the traditions of the fathers. From them, I apprehend, Cedrenus has copied: for, after stating that a lawless race sprang from the intercourse of the sons of Seth with the daughters of Cain (as he rightly understands the inspired account of the intermarriages of the sons of God), he goes on to assert; that, in consequence of their daring rebellion against heaven, the Lord destroyed many of them with fiery globes and thunder-

[1] Ἡμετερων προγονοι πατερων. Orph. Hymn. xxxvi. 2.

[2] See my Dissert. on the Myst. of the Cabir. chap. ix. and Origin of Pagan Idol. passim.

bolts, and finding that the rest remained incorrigible, swept them away at length with the waters of the deluge[1]. The first infliction seems to be that, which is mentioned by St. Jude and St. Peter: and it is worthy of note, that the latter of these apostles, as if obliquely to teach us (what Josephus roundly asserts), that the apostate ANGELI are no other than the giants or Titans of pagan story, has thought proper to use a strictly mythologic word in his description of their imprisonment. In our English translation, God is said to have *cast them down to hell:* but, in the original Greek, the Almighty plunges them into that identical *Tartarus,* which is said to have received the rebellious Titans[2]. The

[1] Cedren. Hist. Compend. p. 10.

[2] Gr. *ταρταρωσας.* It is very curious to compare the language used by St. Peter relative to the messengers, with that employed by some of the pagan writers relative to the Titans.

Ει γαρ ὁ Θεος ΑΓΓΕΛΩΝ *ἁμαρτησαντων εκ εφεισατο, αλλα* ΣΕΙΡΑΙΣ ΖΟΦΟΥ ΤΑΡΤΑΡΩΣΑΣ *παρεδωκεν εις κρισιν* ΤΕΤΗΡΗΜΕΝΟΥΣ. 2 Peter ii. 4.

——— *Κατα δ' εσκιασαν βελεεσσι*
Τιτηνας, και τους μεν ὑπο χθονος ευρυοδειης
Πεμψαν, και ΔΕΣΜΟΙΣΙΝ *εν αργαλεοισιν εδησαν.*
Εννεα δ' αυ νυκτας τε και ἡματα χαλκεος ακμων
Εκ γαιης κατιων δεκατῃ ες ΤΑΡΤΑΡΟΝ *ικεν.*
Τον περι ΧΑΛΚΕΟΝ *'ΕΡΚΟΣ ελληλαται· αμφι δε μιν νυξ*
Τριστοιχει κεχυται περι δειρην· αυταρ ὑπερθεν
Γης ῥιζαι πεφυασι και ατρυγετοιο θαλασσης.
Ενθα ΘΕΟΙ *Τιτηνες ὑπο* ΖΟΦΩι *ηεροεντι*
Κεκρυφαται, βουλῃσι Διος νεφεληγερεταο.
Τοις εκ εξιτον εστι· πυλας δ' επεθηκε Ποσειδων
Χαλκειας, τειχος περικειται δ' αμφοτερωθεν.

second infliction, or the deluge, is mentioned by the Jewish author of *the Wisdom of Solomon*: and he likewise directs our attention to the giants, who make so prominent a figure in the legends of the Gentiles. *In the old time*, says he, *when the proud giants perished, the hope of the world governed by thy hand escaped in a weak vessel, and left to all ages a seed of generation*[1].

Now to what can these remarkable stories refer, when viewed connectedly with the declaration of Josephus, that the faithful preaching of Noah excited such a degree of hostility against him on the part of the apostate messengers and their children, that his very life and the lives of his family were endangered by them? I cannot refrain from thinking that they allude to some daring attempt, not specifically recorded by Moses, to drive the high-priest from his station before the Cherubim, to scale the very mount of God, to break violently into the forbidden recesses of Paradise.

It is easy to prove, that the Olympus of pagan theology is no other than the Paradisiacal

Ενθα Γυγης, Κοττος τε, και ὁ Βριαρεως μεγαθυμος
Ναιεσιν, ΦΥΛΑΚΕΣ πιστοι Διος αιγιοχοιο.
Hesiod. Theog. ver. 716—735.

Τιτηνες, Γαιης τε και Ουρανε αγλαα τεκνα,
Ἡμετερων προγονοι πατερων, γαιης ὑπενερθεν
Οικοις ΤΑΡΤΑΡΙΟΙΣΙ μυχῳ χθονος ενναιοντες.
Orph. Hymn xxxvi.

[1] Wisd. xiv. 6.

mountain; and that the Paradisiacal mountain itself either absolutely coincides with the diluvian mount Ararat, or is at least to be sought for in the same elevated region[1]. The tradition therefore of an attempt to scale Olympus, however wildly it may be disguised by poetic exaggeration, is in effect the tradition of an attempt to scale the mount of Paradise: and both its high antiquity and its very wide circulation are manifest from its reception, as we collect from the language of Josephus respecting the exact similarity of the deeds ascribed to the children of the messengers and to the Hellenic giants, equally among the Jews and the Gentiles. To this madness, in the height of their daring infidelity, the apostate priests seem to have been instigated. Rejecting every idea of an atonement by the incarnate Godhead; and having probably ridiculed among their dissolute associates the fiery manifestation of the Cherubim, on the eastern side of the Paradisiacal mount, as a mere contrivance of the high-priest, handed down from father to son, for the purpose of intimidating the abused multitude: they may have been spurred on to confront the blazing portent, to assail the neighbouring habitation of their pious superior, and to attempt the forbidden hill of Jehovah himself thundering out of the

[1] See Origin of Pagan Idol. book ii. chap. 1. § III. IV. chap. 2. § III.

inmost recesses of the holy garden. At this critical moment the arm of the Lord would be made bare for vengeance: and, if we may give credit to the coinciding traditions both of the Jews and of the Gentiles, now it was, that the rebels were struck with hot thunderbolts and terrific balls of fire. Perhaps a sulphureous torrent from heaven descended upon their heads; as when *the Lord rained upon Sodom and upon Gomorrha brimstone and fire from the Lord:* or perhaps blazing globes might burst forth from the earth; as when the apostate Julian, in defiance of prophecy, sought to lay anew the foundations of the temple at Jerusalem. The ground, at the same time, cleft asunder: and, as Korah and his company of old descended alive into the pit; so these primeval opposers of God, in the manner set forth by St. Peter and St. Jude, were plunged headlong into the central Tartarus, where they are reserved in chains of darkness unto the judgment of the great day. From the same yawning gulph, that swallowed up the traitors, burst forth, I am inclined to believe, the first waters of the now incipient deluge; agreeably to the tradition of the ancient Iranians, that the flood issued from a cavity in the far-famed mountain where Noah was then dwelling[1]:

[1] In libro Pharh. Sur. memoratur mons illustris, ubi tunc habitavit Noah, cum ex eo erumperet aqua diluvii: et ibidem *Zala-Cupha* dicitur fuisse nomen vetulæ, ex cujus furno aqua dilivii primo erupit. Hyde de rel vet. Pers. c. x.

and thus, upon a tremendously grand scale, the general inundation would bear a striking resemblance to the partial inundation, which accompanied the fiery tempest that destroyed the cities of the plain, and which overwhelmed a fruitful tract of country with the bitter waters of the Asphaltite lake[1].

The supposition, that some such event really occurred, will account for the almost universal belief of the Gentiles, that God did not destroy the old world by a deluge of water *alone;* but that fire *also,* violently cracking the shell of the earth and thus opening a way to the mighty central abyss, was an eminently powerful agent in the work of destruction[2]. It will likewise, what is of much greater consequence, perfectly account for the very remarkable language used both by St. Jude and by St. Peter. The former of these apostles closely associates the fiery precipitation of the messengers with the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrha: while the latter of them not only mentions it conjunctively with the destruction of those cities, but specially connects it with God's *sparing not the old world* and his *bringing in the flood upon the world of the ungodly.* Hence, I think, we may collect, that the precipitation of the messengers into Tartarus bore a strong resemblance to the overthrow of

[1] See Origin of Pagan Idol. book iii. chap. 6. § I. 5.
[2] See Horæ Mosaic. book i. sect. i. chap. 4. § IX.

Sodom and Gomorrha, and that it was something distinct from the subsequent general bringing in of an aqueous deluge.

If then the messengers have been at all satisfactorily demonstrated to be the apostate children of Seth, it will follow, that *their* destruction preceded the flood and was effected by a totally different agent; though the very agent employed in their tartarization might be used also as an instrument in God's hand of bringing on the deluge, just as the fire that destroyed Sodom and Gomorrha was attended by a partial inundation of water. Such accordingly, as we have seen, is the account which Cedrenus gives of these early transactions, copied most probably from those old traditions of the Hebrew Church to which Josephus alludes. Some of the rebellious Sethites he states to have been blasted with thunderbolts and fiery globes; while the rest of them, that is to say those who were not immediately concerned in the attack upon Paradise, perished along with the great mass of mankind in the succeeding waters of the deluge [1]. As for Noah himself, he entered into

[1] Ovid relates the very same events in the mythologic style of classical poetry. He tells us, that, *immediately before the deluge*, the giants attempted to scale Olympus; but that they were beaten down by the omnipotent father with hot thunderbolts: and he adds, that, still *immediately before the deluge*, Lycaon was guilty of an act of signal impiety toward Jupiter, which provoked that deity miraculously to destroy

the ark on the very day that the fountains of the mighty deep were broken up[1]: and since we are positively assured that this was the case, I am inclined to think, that the identical fiery storm which destroyed the rebels served also as a safeguard to the righteous high-priest and his family; so that, encompassed by it on all sides as by a blazing wall, they leisurely entered into the ship without experiencing that molestation to which they would otherwise have been liable. Thus, at the passage of the Red sea, the pillar of fire and the cloud was a light and protection to the Israelites; while the Lord, looking out from it upon the host of the Egyptians, *sent forth his arrows and scattered them, shot forth his lightnings and discomfited them*[2]: and thus, in the last ages, Jehovah promises, that he *will be unto Jerusalem a wall of fire round about*[3].

IV. I have already observed, that our Lord compares the time which precedes his second coming to the days of Noah: and I have stated, that one great point of their resemblance would be an open profession of infidelity, such as we have witnessed in our own generation.

his house with avenging fire. The iniquity of the antediluvians having been now consummated, the flood forthwith commenced. Metam. lib. i. ver. 151—312.

[1] Gen. vii. 11, 13.

[2] Compare Exod. xiv. 19, 20, 24, 25. with Psalm xviii. 9—15.

[3] Zechar. ii. 4, 5.

Now the second coming of Christ or the great day of judgment denotes in scriptural language, as it has been well proved by an eminent expositor, not merely a single point of time, but a period of very considerable length; a period, in short, extending from the close of the 1260 days so much celebrated in the prophecies of Daniel and St. John through the whole millennium to the dissolution of all things, when the Messiah shall appear to judge both the quick and the dead [1]. Hence the destruction of Antichrist, at the end of the 1260 days, is considered as immediately ushering in the judgment [2]: and hence, nevertheless, many centuries afterward, a second Antichrist, denominated in the Apocalypse *Gog and Magog*, is also said to be overthrown shortly before the *proper* universal judgment of *the dead*, both *small and great* [3]. If then the state of things, at the destruction of the first Antichrist, is to resemble the days of Noah; yet more strongly, we may apprehend, will such be the case, when the second Antichrist perishes. It is manifest therefore under this view of the subject, that the prophetic account of that last awful event will throw

[1] See Mede's Works. book iv. epist. 8. p. 744, 745. book iii. Treatise on Daniel's Weeks. p. 709. book iv. epist. 15. p, 762, 763.

[2] Dan. vii. 9—14, 21, 22, 26, 27. xi. 45. xii. 1, 2. Rev. xix. 20. xx. 4, 5.

[3] Rev. xx. 7—15.

much light on the transactions which ushered in the deluge; since the close of the present world is to bear a marked similitude to the close of the old world. Now, according to St. John, a circumstance is to occur shortly before the universal judgment, which exhibits so decided a resemblance to the daring attempt and fiery overthrow of the apostate Sethite messengers, that the one may well be deemed a preordained antitype of the other. After a long season of holy repose subsequent to the destruction of the first Antichrist, which may possibly correspond with a check given (as some have imagined) to the Cainites in the days of Enoch, *Satan shall be loosed out of* his millennial *prison: and shall go out to deceive the nations which are in the four quarters of the earth, Gog and Magog, to gather them together to battle; the number of whom is as the sand of the sea. And they went up on the breadth of the earth, and compassed the camp of the saints about and the beloved city: and fire came down from God out of heaven, and devoured them*[1]. I need scarcely point out the exact resemblance in almost every material particular between this yet future event, which is to usher in the dissolution of the present world, and the enterprize and overthrow of the rebellious messengers, which ushered in the dissolution of the

[1] Rev. xx. 7—9.

old world. In each case, the saints are left alone in the midst of a lawless race: in each case, their enemies compass them about on every side: in each case, an attack is made upon the holy mount of God: in each case, the infidels are devoured by fire from the Lord out of heaven: and, as, in one case, the world is immediately afterward swallowed up by a deluge of water; so, in the other case, the world will be shortly afterward swallowed up by a yet more tremendous deluge of fire and brimstone. Thus accurately will the days of Noah resemble the coming of his illustrious antitype the Son of man.

The Sethites however, we are told, are reserved in Tartarus under chains of darkness unto the judgment of the great day: then they are to be brought forth and to receive their sentence in the presence of the assembled universe. Now Tartarus, or the accursed division of Sheol or Hades, in the opinion both of the Jews and of the Gentiles, is a gloomy abode in the central cavity of the earth, corresponding with the lowest abyss of the ocean: and the opinion seems to be confirmed, as well by other passages of Holy Writ, so by the circumstance of our Lord's not commanding the legion of fiends to go down into the deep or (as it is in the original) the abyss, a confinement which they vehemently deprecated, but permitting

them judicially to enter into the herd of swine[1]. The Sethites then, being confined in Tartarus, are confined in the central abyss beneath the ocean: and thence they are to be brought forth, as out of a prison, to the judgment of the great day. Accordingly, as St. Peter and St. Jude pronounce this to be their doom: so the prophet of the Apocalypse seems to allude to their final production, together with the production of the countless multitudes that perished in the deluge, when he pointedly says, that *the sea gave up the dead which were in it*[2].

V. As I thus understand the fallen ANGELS, mentioned by St. Jude and St. Peter, to be no more than certain apostate MESSENGERS or PRIESTS of God: so I am compelled, by the sound principle of homogeneity of exposition, to understand any other ANGEL or ANGELS, mentioned severally by them in the course of the same passage, after a similar manner.

1. Accordingly, I have already supposed Michael the ARCHANGEL, spoken of by St. Jude, to be no created spirit, but our Lord Jesus Christ himself: and I have stated, that the title of ARCHANGEL or CHIEF MESSENGER is betowed upon him, not in reference to his divine nature, but in respect of the covenant office which he graciously sustains.

[1] See Bishop Horsley's Serm. vol. ii. serm. 20.

[2] Rev. xx. 13.

He is so styled, not as God; but as the principal medium of communication between the Father and his creature man: he is so styled, not as an eternal being himself; but as the WORD of Jehovah, as the MESSENGER of the covenant, as the HIGH-PRIEST of the Gospel Dispensation: he is so styled in short, just as, in an inferior and subordinate capacity, every PRIEST of the Lord, who communicates his will to erring mortals, is denominated *an* ANGEL or MESSENGER.

2. In a similar manner therefore I understand those ANGELS, who are mentioned by St. Peter in the clause which is evidently parallel to that wherein Michael the ARCHANGEL is mentioned by St. Jude.

Of the latter, St. Jude says, that he *brought not against Satan a railing accusation, but said, The Lord rebuke thee:* of the former, St. Peter remarks, *Whereas* ANGELS, *which are greater in power and might, bring not a railing accusation against them before the Lord.* Hence the two clauses are manifestly parallel: and hence, whatever principle of interpretation is adopted in the one case, it must also be adopted in the other case.

Now the understanding *the fallen* ANGELS to denote *apostate sacerdotal messengers* requires, that we should view *Michael* as *the chief sacerdotal messenger of Jehovah:* and, if we thus view

Michael; then the ANGELS, who are mentioned in the clause parallel to that wherein *he* is mentioned, must similarly be esteemed subordinate sacerdotal messengers. Such, accordingly, is the manner in which I *do* esteem them.

St. Peter sets out with foretelling, that, as there were *false prophets* in the Levitical Church; so *there shall be false teachers* in the Christian Church or at least under the Christian Dispensation, *who shall privily bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them.* These he afterward describes as men, that *walk after the flesh in the lust of uncleanness and despise government; presumptuous, self-willed, not afraid to speak evil of dignities.* And then he adds, *Whereas* ANGELS, *that are greater in power and might,* that is to say, greater in power and might than these false teachers, *bring not a railing accusation against them,* that is against the dignities, *before the Lord.*

Here the decent moderation of these righteous ANGELS is contrasted with the indecent petulance of those false teachers in the last ages, whose conduct is compared to that of the primeval ANGELS which sinned in keeping not their principality and in leaving their own habitation. The righteous ANGELS therefore must be *men,* no less than the false teachers of the last ages and the primeval ANGELS of the house of Seth: otherwise, there could be no mutual

comparison; for it were nugatory to remark, that the glorious unembodied spirits, who surround the throne of God, are greater in power and might than a knot of mere human false teachers. But, if we suppose the righteous ANGELS to be *men*, as the homogeneity of the whole passage requires; we shall then find the apostle perfectly consistent both in his remark and in his comparison. These pious ANGELS or sacerdotal MESSENGERS are greater in spiritual power and might, than the false teachers who deny the Lord that bought them: and yet, though very possibly they may discern some mixture of human frailty in the appointed dignities both civil and ecclesiastical, *they bring not*, like the apostate pretenders, *a railing accusation against them before the Lord;* but, remembering the precept of the Law and the example of St. Paul, they bear their faculties meekly, and conscientiously refrain from *speaking evil of the ruler of their people*[1].

VI. The general bearing of this discussion upon the main point before us is sufficiently manifest. If the apostasy of Cain and the antediluvians consisted in a bold rejection of the doctrine of *the atonement, through the future sacrifice of the Man-Jehovah born incarnate as the Seed of the woman;* then must that doctrine have

[1] Exod. xxii. 28. Acts xxiii. 5.

been the most prominent doctrine of Patriarchism, then must the special object of the Patriarchal Dispensation have been to inculcate that identical doctrine.

THE END OF VOLUME I.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY R. GILBERT,
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.